



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2011

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. ELLMERS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 16, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RENEE ELLMERS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

"FEARLESS"—STAFF SERGEANT MARK C. WELLS, U.S. ARMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, most Americans are not personally affected by the two wars that America is engaged in the countries of Iraq and Afghanistan. We go about our daily routine. We are concerned about March Madness, the gasoline prices, but war does not really affect most Americans personally. The media doesn't put those events on the front page. They are more concerned about the personal

lives of celebrities than they are about the personal sacrifice of our warriors overseas.

But war is real. Real Americans are tenaciously fighting on two fronts for the rest of us. For them, it is personal; and for their families, it is very personal. The United States is engaged in the longest continuous combat in American history as our troops serve overseas.

Staff Sergeant Mark C. Wells was 31 years of age. He was a member of the United States Army, and he was killed on March 5, 2011, in the Helmand province of Afghanistan by an IED. That is an improvised explosive device. That is the way the cowards that we do battle with fight our troops. Of course, they wouldn't come out in the open because they would be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mark was born in San Jose, California, and his parents live in Spring, Texas, in my district. He joined the United States Army in 2003. Growing up he always said, "I want to be in the Army."

He was a volunteer, Madam Speaker, as all of those that are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan are. They are volunteers. They have the motto, "Here am I. Send me." And Mark went. He went to Iraq for 14 months serving on active duty, and he has been in Afghanistan since August of last year. He was a member of the 303 EOD Battalion and, get this, Madam Speaker, an explosive ordinance disposal technician. And, yes, that means exactly what it says.

His dad, Burl, told me this week that his son was "fearless." What a great attribute for an American warrior. And he also wanted to be a soldier. Also, at the age of 12, he learned how to play the bagpipes. It goes back to his Irish heritage. He grew up eating corned beef and cabbage. And when he was in Iraq, one of his assignments was to play the bagpipes at funerals for other soldiers that had been killed in combat.

He would continually say, "I love the Army." His dad said of his son Mark, "He was my personal hero."

His family said he was patriotic, he was a great dad, and he loved America. He leaves behind a wife, Danielle, who is 8 months pregnant, also a son named Finn that is 2 years of age.

His father would say that, "Mark understood the risk involved in being in the Army, but he loved what he was doing. And, what I miss most is I won't be able to talk to him anymore."

Madam Speaker, being in the Army affects people personally, like his father, Burl, and his mother, Sharon; his wife, Danielle; Finn, their son; and a baby yet to be born.

Mark Wells' memorial service will be on St. Patrick's Day. Yes, that Irish heritage comes into play.

Many of us in this House have been down the street at Arlington Cemetery to attend the funerals of our warriors that have been killed overseas. We all know about those bagpipers that stand on the hill and play "Amazing Grace" in the fog as we bury our war dead. So I suspect that on St. Patrick's Day another bagpiper will play for the funeral of Mark Wells, Staff Sergeant of the United States Army, and play that amazing song, "Amazing Grace."

Madam Speaker, the cause for America and the cause for freedom is expensive. It cost America a son, it cost America a husband, and it cost America a daddy.

Where does America get such great men? They are the rare breed. They are the American breed. And our prayers go out for his family. But while we mourn the loss of Mark Wells, we should also thank the good Lord that such men as Mark Wells ever lived.

And that's just the way it is.

TAX EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1845

Mr. HOYER. Last week, as I have been doing for a number of weeks, I have been speaking about our budget and the crisis that confronts us and the challenge that confronts us.

Last week, former Republican Congressman Joe Scarborough said this about the hard work of getting America out of debt: "The belief of some on the right that America can balance the budget by cutting education, infrastructure, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and home heating assistance to the poor is tantamount to budgetary witchcraft." That was Joe Scarborough, a former conservative Republican Member of Congress from northern Florida.

Last week, Budget Committee Chair PAUL RYAN expressed a similar thought when he said this: "If you literally think you can just balance the budget by cutting waste, fraud, and abuse, foreign aid, and NPR, it doesn't work like that," said PAUL RYAN, chairman of the Budget Committee.

Both Congressman Scarborough and Congressman RYAN are exactly right. Last week I explained why Republicans' spending plan, even as it cripples America's competitiveness, barely makes a dent in our debt. That is because the spending targeted by Republicans, non-security discretionary spending, only amounts to 14 percent of the entire budget. Should we focus on that? Yes. Can we get to where we need to be from there? No.

If you want to meet an arbitrary goal of cutting \$100 billion and you confine yourself to just 14 percent of the budget, you severely damage investments in education, in innovation, and in competitiveness without making our fiscal condition significantly healthier.

That is why, to really get our debt under control, we have to go beyond that 14 percent. We have to stop making the cuts that, while reckless, are politically easy. We have to start doing what is in the best interests of our country even though it is politically hard.

That means addressing the defense spending that takes in more than one quarter of our budget. It means making hard choices that can keep our entitlements strong for generations to come. But we also need to pass deficit-reducing tax reform.

Our Tax Code is a monumental collection of rules and regulations riddled with loopholes and preferences which are a drain on job creation and, frankly, exacerbate the deficit.

□ 1010

Many of those loopholes, or tax expenditures, as they are also called, are popular with all sorts of special interests. But they exact a high price from the rest of us: billions of dollars and more than 225 million collective hours spent on tax preparation, money and time that could be invested in more productive activity.

Just as importantly, when the Tax Code is full of loopholes, businesses and

families start making decisions on maximizing tax breaks, not on their economic common sense. Closing those loopholes in return for lower tax rates frees us all to make more economically sensible choices; in other words, fewer preferences, lower rates.

Closing those loopholes can also reduce the deficit. In the spending bill on the floor this week, total discretionary spending for fiscal year 2011 adds up to \$1.1 trillion, an awful lot of money. How much do our tax expenditures cost for the same fiscal year? Coincidentally, \$1.1 trillion. This chart reflects that reality: \$1.077 trillion in expenditures, \$1.068 trillion, almost exactly the same sum, in tax expenditures. How much do our tax expenditures cost for the same fiscal year? Just as much as we spend on non-security discretionary spending and security spending.

Clearly, tax expenditures must be part of the answer. The two commissions that met to try to focus on getting our deficit under control, making sure that we are economically viable into the next century and making sure that our children are not left in a deep economic hole, that they will have the resources necessary to meet the challenges of their time and will not look at our generation as the generation of debt, said as much.

It must be part of the answer, tax expenditures, because if we attempt to solve our debt without addressing defense, entitlements, and revenues, we are fighting with one hand and four fingers behind our back.

HONORING THE WORK OF THE PIEDMONT WOMEN'S CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor life and the work of a ministry that is literally saving lives in the State of South Carolina. But before I begin, let us pause to recognize our friends in Japan and the tragic loss of life there.

The Piedmont Women's Center is a Christian ministry in the Upstate, providing love and compassion to literally thousands of young women each year who face unplanned pregnancies. By offering free pregnancy tests, limited ultrasounds, and confidential counseling, they have protected the most innocent among us, the unborn.

The doors of this life-affirming ministry opened 20 years ago this day next door to the largest abortion clinic in South Carolina. In 1991, a group of Christians came together and decided to collectively start a ministry funded by individuals, churches, and businesses to offer real alternatives to those in crisis.

The staff and volunteers of the Piedmont Women's Center can hold newborn babies who have been given the gift of life because of their ministry.

They have countless stories of real people, like Liza and her boyfriend, Peter, who came into their center early one Saturday morning with the intent of ending their pregnancy at the abortion clinic next door, a story that I would like to submit and share with you today.

Minutes before this young couple came through the door, the four volunteers at the center joined hands and prayed that God would do a work of redemption in someone's life that morning. Their "Amen" had barely been voiced when the door opened and Liza and Peter, mistaking the center for an abortion clinic, entered and announced they were there for their appointment. In 10 minutes, the life of their 12-week-old unborn child was scheduled to end.

Realizing that they were not at the abortion clinic, they started to leave. The director boldly stepped up and asked them to use the 10 minutes before their appointment to talk about their decision. They agreed.

Alone, Liza went into the counseling room with the director while a volunteer talked with Peter about their unborn child. Later, Peter was invited to join Liza, who had made the decision to trust our director and have an ultrasound. This decision would change their lives forever.

Our volunteer nurse sonographer silently prayed, and with her highly skilled touch, the cold steel of the ultrasound machine came alive with activity. Liza and Peter were mesmerized as they observed the antics of the little life they had conceived. They both melted at the sight of their precious child and completely changed their minds about their abortion.

They wept as they tried to contain their excitement. Not only had a baby been saved, but before their eyes the King of Kings, the Lord of Lords had penetrated their hardened hearts and allowed them to see past their fears and enabled them to accept their child as God's creation.

Liza shared that she was an adopted child, and Peter said his family had offered to help financially so they could continue their college education. They walked out of the center teary-eyed and full of joy, their shining countenance giving evidence to the change that had taken place in their hearts.

Lenna Fox Neill, the CEO for the past 20 years at the Piedmont Women's Center, said she is continually encouraged as she sees more and more in her community who are giving of their time, energy, and resources to see that all life is protected and respected.

Piedmont Women's Center helped establish the South Carolina Association of Pregnancy Care Centers 10 years ago for the purpose of providing a network across the State of compassionate ministries to care for women in need. The abortion rate through collaborative efforts of ministries and legislation has reduced the rate of abortions in my home State of South Carolina almost 50 percent in the last 20 years.

While Congress is fighting to defund Planned Parenthood and protect life at conception, the staff and volunteers at the Piedmont Women's Center are on the front lines every day literally saving lives.

I would like to congratulate the Piedmont Women's Center and their CEO, Lenna Neill, on reaching their 20th anniversary. I thank them for their commitment to protecting the most innocent among us and wish them God's blessing as they continue to spread their ministry across the Palmetto State.

May God bless you, the unborn, and may God continue to bless America.

STOPPING THE ASSAULT ON PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the Republican assault on public broadcasting continues. We are told that tomorrow we will be considering H.R. 1076, which really goes further than anything that we have considered to date. It would prohibit the purchase of any content for public broadcasting resources using Federal money.

Now, I think we are going to see in the course of the debate some unfortunate, and I hope unintended, consequences.

It is ironic that my Republican friends who came to Congress this time with a pledge of regular order, that everybody would have 72 hours to review legislation online, that we are going to have the committee process working in a robust fashion, have again decided to violate their own rules by rushing this to the floor without extensive committee work and without being available for Americans to review this legislation for 72 hours.

I don't understand why, but I can guess that if they really want to try to pass this, they would be far better off rushing it, not having it carefully examined.

First and foremost, the whole point of public broadcasting is the development and broadcast of content that doesn't have commercial value, that doesn't inspire the networks, the channels, radio and television, to be able to sell advertising for this particular type of program.

You will search in vain reviewing the thousands of commercial radio and television stations, cable channels and networks, to find the type of educational programming that we rely on PBS for, for example, to supply to our children. There is no content for our children on the vast commercial sea of broadcasting that doesn't come from people who are trying to sell something to our kids, not educate them.

□ 1020

You're at a time when news is shrinking in the commercial arena.

Newspapers are getting thinner. Broadcast networks are withdrawing correspondence from overseas at precisely the time that the American public needs to know what is happening in the Middle East, in Japan. At precisely the time commercial coverage is shrinking, public broadcasting has actually expanded coverage and, in fact, at times devotes a lot of time and attention to boring news—boring news which often we find is some of the most important for us to understand.

This proposal would prohibit not just purchase of NPR, which is the target. Ironically, National Public Radio has a miniscule level of support from the Federal Government. Most of this money flows to provide content and programming to smaller stations in rural and small-town America, where they don't have the financial base to be able to provide robust public broadcasting.

We're always going to have public broadcast stations in New York and San Francisco, Los Angeles. Even Portland, Oregon, a medium-size city, will have that resource. It will be diminished if we don't have the program support, but it will be there. In rural Burns, Oregon, where it costs 11 times as much to send a signal, that's where it's going to be hit.

Now, denying the ability to purchase content doesn't mean just NPR. It's "Car Talk." It's "Prairie Home Companion." And most significantly, in my mind, it is some of the special programs that have been developed for the Pacific Northwest. Again, no commercial station would do it because no advertiser will pay for it. But it serves a market for important news that people need to have about their communities. It's not just in the Pacific Northwest. It's in the Rocky Mountain States, in the Upper Midwest. In fact, some of these stations are the sole source of programming. And so by prohibiting the use of this resource, it's going to cut them off at the knees.

Well, that's unfortunate because public broadcasting is the most trusted name in American media. It's why Republicans and Democrats alike don't want it cut. In fact, some would even increase it. I hope my colleagues will listen to what the American public wants and reject this legislation.

GENERAL PETRAEUS AND "THE CHARLIE SHEEN COUNTERINSUR- GENCY STRATEGY"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the American people are rapidly losing confidence in the Nation's Afghanistan policy. Public opposition has reached an all-time high. According to the new ABC News/Washington Post poll, nearly two-thirds of Americans, or 64 percent, say this war isn't worth fighting. I wonder if any of the programs that my Republican colleagues want to cut

have sunk to that level of nonsupport. And yet this charade goes on.

The July drawdown, the date we should be leaving Afghanistan, is rapidly approaching; and there are precious few signs of preparations for a massive military redeployment. In fact, top officials have been "walking back" the July 2011 commitment from almost the moment the President made it.

General Petraeus has returned to Capitol Hill this week to pat us on the head and tell us the same things he's told us before. During testimony he gave last year, he offered up this—I call it a doozy—describing the July deadline as "the point at which a process begins to transition security tasks to Afghan forces at a rate to be determined by conditions at the time." With all due respect to the general, Madam Speaker, that's an awful lot of weasel words.

His testimony in the Senate yesterday didn't inspire much confidence either. He continues to offer the same bland and tone-deaf talking points—a lot of vague reassurances about progress we've supposedly made, while being sure to say that challenges remain so he can continue justifying a substantial troop presence. He's over here on the House side today. I hope my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee will hold his feet to the fire, demanding the clarity and candor that the American people deserve.

With everyone hanging on General Petraeus' every word, even though he is the symbol of a discredited and unpopular policy, I thought some of us should speak for the overwhelming majority opinion—for that 64 percent. So yesterday, the Congressional Progressive Caucus Peace and Security Task Force held a briefing with a fascinating group of panelists. We heard from Robert Pape, the suicide terrorism scholar, who posed an interesting analogy—if suicide bombings are the lung cancer of terrorism, then foreign occupation is the smoking habit, the lethal but preventable addiction that's feeding the illness.

Matthew Hoh, the former marine captain and State Department official, noted that we're laying off police officers here at home while building up a corrupt and ineffective police force in Afghanistan. And Rolling Stone contributing editor Michael Hastings, who recently broke the story about the Army using psyops propaganda on U.S. Senators, was also there; and he made this observation. He said General Petraeus is giving us "the Charlie Sheen counterinsurgency strategy, which is to give exclusive interviews to every major network and keep saying you're winning and hope the public actually agrees with you."

Madam Speaker, it was a compelling briefing. I hope all of us in the 112th Congress will listen to people like Professor Pape, Mr. Hoh, and Mr. Hastings. But, most of all, I hope we'll listen to the American people, who are angry,

disillusioned, and pleading with us to bring our troops home. They want us to do that so there will be no more deaths like Staff Sergeant Mark Wells, the young man from Congressman POE's district.

HONORING DALE EVERETT CRANE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUAYLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who lived a life that epitomized the American Dream—a man who put his family and country first, yet never asked for anything in return. We here in Washington talk a lot about the American Dream. Unfortunately, we often talk about this dream in abstract terms. Yet, every day there are people all across this great country who are living this dream without any recognition.

And for many of them, that's exactly how they like it. They don't want accolades or praise. They simply want to live a happy life and be surrounded by the people they love. They believe that building a strong family and serving their country is nothing special. They believe it's ordinary. Madam Speaker, that mindset and that belief is what makes these people extraordinary, and that is what made Dale Everett Crane extraordinary.

Dale Crane came from humble beginnings in southern California. After he graduated from high school, Dale briefly attended college until he found another calling. Instead of furthering his education, Dale joined the marines and went on to fight for our country in Vietnam. After being honorably discharged from his beloved corps, he met the love of his life, Shawn, and married her. Dale went on to be a successful small businessman. He scraped and he saved; but in the end, he built up one of those small businesses that make our country strong.

Although Dale built a tremendous small business, this was not his greatest accomplishment. In Dale's mind, his greatest accomplishment was his family. His marriage to Shawn and his four children were far and away the most important thing in his life. I don't know this because I read a story about Dale in a newspaper. I know this because I felt it firsthand. Dale Crane was my father-in-law. The love he knew for his family knew no bounds—and if we all embraced this love of family and country, we would be in a better place.

Madam Speaker, on February 19 of this year, Dale Crane's family and friends mourned his death. But more importantly, we celebrated his life. We will never forget the sacrifices he made for his family and his country.

□ 1030

REPUBLICANS RESCHEDULE DEBATE ON HOME AFFORDABLE MODIFICATION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I am here to report that the Republican follies continue today.

Today, we were scheduled to debate the Republicans' proposal to terminate the President's foreclosure prevention program called HAMP. But late last night, the Republican leadership decided to postpone debate until after returning from the recess.

As the country faces a number of problems, including a serious housing crisis, the House Republican leadership decided that today wasn't the best time to terminate a program that has helped more than half a million homeowners stay in their homes.

See, tomorrow, the House will close up shop until March 28, and Republicans recognize that killing a foreclosure prevention program today would be bad politics. It would force Republican Members to go home and defend this feckless move for 10 straight days—to defend ending a foreclosure prevention program face to face with the people they represent, many of whom are struggling right now to keep their mortgage and keep their home. But, after the 10-day recess, when House Republicans come back out of the sight of their constituents, they'll move forward with their plans to end the home loan modification program.

This kind of leadership is disgraceful. American homeowners are struggling. Nearly 7 million homeowners are facing foreclosure in this country. One in every four houses are owned by people who owe more than the house is worth. Nearly half a million homeowners have been able to stay in their homes because of the Affordable Modification Program, or HAMP. Ending that program will undoubtedly kick families out of their homes. That's something the Republicans realized they didn't want to do before a 10-day recess.

I'll be the first to admit the Affordable Modification Program is not perfect. So let's fix it or replace it with something better. However, I have yet to see a legitimate alternative from House Republicans. They just want to cut, cut, cut, cut. Cutting deficits is important, but the Republicans' policies and scheduling gimmicks indicate that they don't really care about the American people.

Every Republican Member should watch the "60 Minutes" special, entitled, "Hard Times Generation." It aired two Sundays ago, on March 6. The special focused on families that were homeowners and part of the middle class before the 2007 recession started. Now hundreds of thousands of those American people are homeless and hun-

gry for the first time in their lives. The children of one former home-owning family described what it was like to live in their parents' van. Before school, they'd go to a Walmart bathroom to brush their teeth, wash their faces, and get cleaned up to go to school. The kids and their parents are now living in a motel room, the whole family of six, which is, quote, "better than the van," although it's small.

Is this the America that Republicans want our children to grow up in? Are Republicans really comfortable killing a program that has prevented 500,000 people from moving out of their house and living in their car? Clearly, my Republican colleagues need a wake-up call today, and I am here to help. Watch that "60 Minutes" special.

I've made it easier for you to watch the "60 Minutes" segment. All you have to do is go to my Web site, mcdermott.house.gov, then click on the very first slide in the slideshow that says, "60 Minutes Special: Poverty." If you see that, click on it and you can watch what's going on.

And when my colleagues, Madam Speaker, are back in their districts over the 10-day recess after they've watched this, then they should meet with some of these people and see what their thoughts are about ending the program and doing nothing to help American families. If they still believe that they should simply do away with the modification program, my belief is they have forgotten why they were elected and who they represent.

The housing program that we will debate after the 10-day recess has saved the homes of over half a million people, or 500,000 families. It's far from perfect, but we need to focus on improving it or replacing it with something better, not just killing it.

How many more kids have to take their morning bath in the Walmart bathroom or the Exxon gasoline bathroom before we begin to help the homeowners who were caught in the debacle from Wall Street from which not one person has gone to prison or served one single day?

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 36 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Come and help us, Lord our God. Those wounded returning from war are not afraid to submit themselves to physicians. In this humility, they live patience and offer You alone the glory. By their being faithful to the course outlined for them, they learn that it takes many small steps to make full recovery.

In the same light, O Lord, grant this Nation patience. Give this representative government wise discernment and courageous action to excise whatever poisons the whole system while preserving each healthy member.

As we pray today, we ask You, Divine Physician, to bless, sustain and reward the Navy medical team that cares for Members, staff and guests here on Capitol Hill. With them, may we give full measure as we serve in Your holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side.

RECOGNIZING DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1987, President Ronald Reagan officially declared March as Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month. He called upon our Nation to provide understanding, encouragement and opportunities to help persons with developmental disabilities lead productive and fulfilling lives. There are currently over 7 million Americans who experience developmental disabilities. Disabilities have no boundaries. They cut across the lines of racial, ethnic, educational, social and economic backgrounds and can occur in any family.

As an individual with significant hearing disability and a grandfather of a child with special needs, I am very familiar with the hardships of over-

coming the obstacles of disabilities. My grandson, Maxwell, has CHARGE syndrome and deals with intensive developmental and medical challenges every day of his life. He is a true inspiration to our family and our community.

During Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month, I encourage us all to learn more about the people in our community who have developmental disabilities and to recognize that all of us have talents and abilities that we can offer to make this a better Nation.

REPUBLICANS PUSH SPENDING CUTS THAT DESTROY JOBS

(Ms. BASS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the majority's spending plan that would cost jobs and threaten our economic recovery. Republicans have held the majority for 11 weeks now, and we have yet to see a jobs plan. Instead of focusing on jobs, which is the number one priority of Americans, the majority is pushing spending cuts that destroy thousands of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the majority is ignoring the warnings from economists that the sharp cuts they propose would guarantee major job losses in the public and private sectors. The Economic Policy Institute shows that the majority's plan would destroy more than 800,000 jobs. Mark Zandi, JOHN MCCAIN's former economic adviser, puts the job loss figure at 700,000. No matter who is right, the number is far too high.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't particularly like public employees, but we do need to ask just who are these public employees. Just one example is the staff at the tsunami warning center. Under the majority's plan, the National Weather Service, the agency that houses the tsunami center that issued alerts after Friday's earthquake—and there was significant damage in California after the tsunami—would be cut by \$126 million. These cuts would result in furloughs and office closures affecting the center's ability to issue future warnings.

The type of cuts proposed by the majority does not create jobs; it destroys them. I urge the majority to work with us on a responsible spending plan that drives economic growth and job creation.

GAS PRICES

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, where do we get the gasoline to power our cars and jet fuel to power our airplanes? We all know that it comes from oil and that its price is dictated by supply and demand.

President Obama realizes this. In fact, his advisers have considered opening up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in order to stabilize supply. But if we are willing to open up this emergency supply, then why are we not taking advantage of the natural reserves that we have throughout our Nation?

Following BP's careless accident in the gulf, six deepwater drilling rigs left for foreign shores, some even moving to Egypt. Deepwater drilling will continue, but off foreign shores. America will continue to need oil, but it will increasingly come from foreign nations. Rather than reducing our dependence on foreign fossil fuels, the actions of this administration are increasing them.

With instability in the Middle East, our gas prices naturally rise. Let's open our natural reserves off our shores and throughout our country. Let's create energy jobs here and stabilize the price of gasoline in the United States.

COMMEMORATING ST. JOSEPH'S DAY

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the rich history of the Italian American community in the United States as we celebrate the Feast of St. Joseph—La Festa Di San Giuseppe—on March 19. St. Joseph was credited with preventing a famine in Sicily in the Middle Ages, and the Feast of St. Joseph is celebrated widely among Italian Americans—including my family and many others across my home State of Rhode Island—and is an opportunity to recall the many contributions of Italian Americans to our country and to honor the patron saint of the family.

Here in the United States, we recognize the powerful impact of the Italian American experience, which began five centuries ago with the explorations of Vespucci and Verrazano. Italian Americans represent some of this country's, and indeed the world's, foremost innovators—in health and science, business and industry, politics and government, arts and culture.

In celebrating the many milestones of the Italian American heritage on this Feast of St. Joseph, we honor the lives, work, and rich history of Italian Americans throughout our Nation.

Buona Festa Di San Giuseppe, Happy St. Joseph's Day, to everyone.

HONORING WES LEONARD AND THE FENNVILLE BLACKHAWKS BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a young man named Wes Leonard in Michigan,

the Fennville Blackhawks, and the community that rallied around that family.

Wes was a star basketball player who, after winning a basketball game with the final shot of the game on March 3, collapsed and passed away a short while later. That was an undefeated season for the Blackhawks, and they went on 3 days later to start their first playoff game. They won four additional games.

At the visitation for Wes's family, I was struck by the rival teams that showed up in their letter jackets to come and honor and pay respects to Wes, his family, and the team that he led. This team played admirably throughout all of their final games. On Monday, this run came to an end. But a true mark of character, as I said to these young players, is how they respond to adversity. These young men truly are of character.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we rise today and honor Wes, the team, and the fans that supported them and that they accept condolences on my behalf and the behalf of so many others who have asked, as I have been wearing this ribbon, to pass those condolences along to the community and to his family.

We thank Wes for his leadership and all that he has done for his community.

□ 1210

DEVASTATING EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI IN NORTHERN JAPAN

(Ms. HIRONO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I grew up in Fukushima, Japan, where earthquake preparedness is part of life, but nothing could have prepared any nation for the natural disasters that occurred on Friday.

While my mother has successfully contacted our relatives in Japan, many families haven't been able to find or contact their loved ones. Thousands of victims are in shelters. Many are still missing. The death toll continues to rise.

"Tsunami" is a Japanese word that the world understands. We have seen the 30-foot walls of water sweeping across farmlands, wiping out everything in its path.

"Gaman" is a Japanese word that describes strength and endurance. Gaman will help the Japanese people through this tragedy, but they do not stand alone. People from all over the world have sent messages of support, and donations continue. In the midst of tragedy, common humanity transcends geopolitical boundaries.

Hawaii's ties to Japan are deep. Hawaii's banks are donation dropoff points. The Hawaii blood bank is coordinating a national drive. Fukushima and Miyagi Kenjin Kai and the Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce are among many helping.

Minasan, doomo arigatou gozaimasu—everyone, thank you very much.

OBAMA'S IRRESPONSIBLE ENERGY POLICY

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, we in Louisiana had to suffer through the BP spill, which is bad enough, but look what the President has done to us since. First, he placed a moratorium on offshore drilling, killing thousands of Louisiana jobs. Then the President was held in contempt of court for not issuing permits, and now we have two token permits created when gas prices are headed to \$4 a gallon. On top of that we have a tax on coal, domestic oil, and hydrofracking, which is necessary for natural gas production. Finally, Secretary Chu told us higher prices may be a good thing.

Perhaps we're discovering President Obama's real agenda, and that is deliberately constraining fossil fuel production to make prices go higher so alternative energy sources, which aren't really cutting it in the marketplace, will appear more competitive.

NO JOBS PLAN AND ASSAULT ON MIDDLE CLASS HOMEOWNERS

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have had control of this Chamber for 11 weeks now, and yet there's still no plan to create jobs or spur our economic recovery. Instead of tackling unemployment, my Republican colleagues are again targeting vital programs designed to keep families in their homes.

The Republicans are proposing to terminate the Home Affordable Modification Program, which provides critical mortgage modifications to deserving homeowners who are facing devastating foreclosures. To date, more than 600,000 homeowners have received a permanent mortgage modification, and tens of thousands of Americans are joining their ranks each month.

The Republicans also want to eliminate the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which works to stabilize areas hard-hit by the housing crisis by helping States and cities purchase foreclosed homes and protect the value of our communities. My home State of New Jersey is slated to receive \$11.5 million through this program.

Mr. Speaker, this is funding that my constituents need to help redevelop our communities, create jobs, and grow our local economies. I urge my colleagues to stop blindly cutting programs and focus on legislation to create jobs and bring the economy around.

NO MORE SHORT-TERM CONTINUING RESOLUTIONS

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, no more short-term continuing resolutions. All respected economists and the deficit commission have told us we should not make cuts in this fiscal year.

Is no one listening? These short and the longer CRs will make our recession worse and destroy jobs. At a time when the recovery is beginning to make small steps forward, these cuts will destroy the progress we have made.

Yesterday, the Republican majority cut wildfire suppression by \$200 million. Oklahoma, are you hearing this? Flood prevention, again. Are you hearing that, New Jersey? Funding for police. Don't Americans deserve safe neighborhoods? Programs that protect our food supply. Good for salmonella and E. coli but not for the American people.

It isn't enough for Republicans to deny the science on greenhouse gases; H.R. 44 and 48 cut funding from EPA programs that keep our air clean and our water safe. Are we creating jobs? No. Are we making a dent in the deficit? No. But are we hurting families? Yes.

Don't stop the recovery our people need. Listen to the experts. Extend the CR at 2010 levels. No more cuts this year.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans' budget would endanger American lives while it destroys American jobs. It will increase every American's likelihood of getting sick from unsafe meat and poultry, contaminated drinking water, and foreign food additives. Fewer police will make our streets less safe. The chances of curing cancer, Parkinson's, and Alzheimer's disease are all seriously diminished. Most of the cuts target poor people, but the hundreds of program cuts will also endanger all of our lives.

We've thrown hundreds of programs into a dump truck Republicans call H.R. 1 bound for the trash compactor. Let's reach in, though, and look at just one of those: meat inspection. The law requires a Federal inspector to be present at all 6,000 slaughterhouses and packing plants across the country, but this Republican budget's 19 percent cut will require 8,600 such inspectors to be furloughed for 22 days, which means that packing plants like Hormel's may have to lay off thousands of people for that period of time.

Why do this when Federal inspectors stopped 9.5 million pounds of poisoned meat just last year alone in 71 recalls. Let's derail this dump truck called H.R. 1.

GET AMERICA WORKING AGAIN

(Mr. WALZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, we've all been here since January, dutifully collecting paychecks, and no budget for the American public, creating uncertainties in the businesses and keeping job growth down. It's straining our national security forces and making difficult choices for our Reserve commanders to plan ahead. It's putting political ideology above job creation and facts.

My Republican colleague friends have often told me what they thought last November's election meant and what the American people were saying. I will tell you what they weren't saying: We want you to go to Washington and put party above what's good for America; we want you to play chicken with America's economic future; we want you to protect millionaire CEO's and then blame the middle class and make sure you cut programs to their children; we want you to hold countless hearings on issues that do nothing except divide America and won't create a single job; oh, yeah, and we want you to point fingers at the other side and blame them, even though you run the House.

Here's what I think they might have been saying: Be leaders, compromise for the good of the country, and get America working again.

PROVIDE HOMEOWNERS TIME

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our homeowners need help right now, and I'm asking this Congress to provide homeowners with something they don't have when they're facing foreclosure. It's time—time to find more income, time to find another buyer to pay off the mortgage, and most importantly, time and leverage to negotiate with their lender and mortgage holder, who typically keeps losing the paperwork until the homeowner runs out of time.

So I'm asking this Congress to freeze all foreclosures for homeowners who deserve it, for homeowners who can afford to maintain their property, because that's the best way to stabilize our economy and to save family homes.

□ 1220

NOAA FUNDING CUTS

(Ms. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am really concerned about the continuing resolution we passed yesterday with over \$1 billion in cuts to one of the most important Federal agencies, NOAA. That's right, our weather and natural disaster folks.

When some people think of NOAA, they think of an agency that only impacts the coastal States, so cuts to this agency wouldn't impact them or their families. But it's important to know that every time we get the day's weather so we can prepare and make sure we are warm or dry, we use NOAA technology. Every time we get alerts about tornadoes or earthquakes, it's NOAA's technology.

In the wake of the tsunami that devastated Japan, the House yesterday passed a measure that would hamper our own ability to detect tsunamis. Currently, seven of the 39 Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis, DART, stations are non-operational due to broken moorings and equipment failures. And the cuts that we made yesterday put us in jeopardy—that's right—in the Pacific Ocean, in the Atlantic, and in the gulf. We are all in jeopardy because of those cuts yesterday, and NOAA won't have an opportunity to repair them and to restore them, degrading the quality of our warnings.

Mr. Speaker, this is senseless, and it's time for the American people to speak up against this senseless policy.

THE REPUBLICAN WAR ON THE MIDDLE CLASS

(Ms. CLARKE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the majority's aggressive war on the middle class and those who aspire to be in the middle class. Today we're debating two bills that, if passed, will leave Americans with no Federal support to save their homes, and the worsening of the foreclosure crisis. Which, in effect, is a "body blow" that will leave millions of Americans who are struggling to find jobs even more vulnerable to losing their homes.

We are now in the 11th week of the 112th Congress, and the majority has yet to bring a single jobs bill to the floor for a vote. Instead, the majority has proposed a long-term continuing resolution that would eliminate 700,000 jobs while at the same time protecting tax cuts for multimillionaires and billionaires, the so-called job creators. The question remains, what exactly is the majority proposing to incentivize and encourage job creation? Where are the jobs? Mr. Speaker, the American people are waiting for the majority to stop the recalcitrant assault on the middle class and those who are aspiring to be in the middle class and work in a bipartisan way to do what we all were elected to do, which is to work for them, not against them.

WE NEED A REAL BUDGET

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know we're not supposed to remind us of our history. I won't be long. But if you will recall, some 8 years prior to this present administration, day after day after day, our budget was simply imploding with millions, trillions of dollars going into the war in Iraq. So here we are. Someone wants to blame the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Well, let me explain to you, we were in double-digit unemployment. Look where we are today, going up and not down in terms of job creation and going down in terms of unemployment. The economy was sick, and it is coming back. But what do our colleagues want to do? Pass CRs that every economist says is the wrong direction to go in 2011.

It's like you started out with \$150 for the household expenses that you have. You had that money to pay for the expenses of that month, and all of a sudden, somebody came and said, You know what, I'm taking \$75 away from you, so you don't have that money to pay your expenses. And guess what, you are in the hole. Why are you cutting budgets in 2011? Why are you cutting 16,000 law enforcement jobs? Why are you cutting 800,000 jobs? Why are you cutting 800 Border Patrol jobs? This is the wrong direction to go. We need a real budget. We need real leadership. Adults need to come to the table and work together and solve this budget crisis.

HAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY TO WESTMINSTER, COLORADO

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th birthday of the city of Westminster, Colorado, one of the Colorado Front Range urban corridor's principal cities. Westminster is framed by the natural beauty of the nearby Rocky Mountains. Westminster's scenic and convenient setting is located between the economic hubs of Denver and Boulder, which has attracted many residents and businesses to the city. Settlers from the East first came to the area of Westminster in the 1870s. It used to be known as the Village of Harris and was formally founded as the town of Westminster on April 4, 1911.

Westminster is notable in the Front Range urban area for its long-term commitment to the preservation of open spaces. It has received numerous national rewards and recognition for sustainable development, technology integration in city government, and quality of life. The miles of trails provide public access for outdoor recreational activities that are so important to Colorado residents. I congratulate the people of Westminster on 100 years of progress and prosperity and look eagerly forward to what the future holds for this forward-looking Colorado city.

STILL NO JOBS PLAN AFTER 11 WEEKS

(Mr. HINCHEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINCHEY. We have now gone 11 weeks and still there hasn't been any action in committee or on this House floor on anything resembling a jobs plan from our friends here in the majority. In fact, we've seen just the opposite. Economists are estimating that from the initial action here, an estimated 800,000 jobs will be lost under their first plan and many more over the course of the rest of this issue. Hundreds of New York Head Start teachers will be fired, and thousands more teachers will be fired all across America. Thousands of my constituents won't be able to find jobs because of cuts to the Workforce Investment Act that will close job centers throughout New York, as well as thousands of others that will be closed in other States all across America. And jobs in the Hudson Valley's growing solar energy industry will be hurt by cuts to investments in renewable energy, just as it will be cut all across America. After 11 weeks, it's clear that the Republicans don't just have a no-jobs agenda, they have an anti-jobs agenda. And New Yorkers and millions of others across America will pay the price for their bad policies.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 28, AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider House Concurrent Resolution 28 in the House, if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or her designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except: number one, 1 hour of debate controlled by Representative KUCINICH of Ohio or his designee; and, number two, 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and that section 7 of the War Powers Resolution not apply to the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 839, HAMP TERMINATION ACT OF 2011; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 861, NSP TERMINATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 170 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 170

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 839) to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to terminate the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide new assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program, while preserving assistance to homeowners who were already extended an offer to participate in the Program, either on a trial or permanent basis. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The com-

mittee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report (except that amendment number 9 and amendment number 10 may be offered only en bloc), may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 170 provides for a structured rule designed and designated by the Rules Committee for consideration of H.R. 861 and H.R. 839. This rule allows the amendments submitted to the Rules Committee to be made in order as long as they were not subject to a point of order and were germane to the underlying text of H.R. 861 and H.R. 839.

This rule provides for debate and amendment opportunities for members of the minority and the majority to change the legislative text of the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the two underlying bills. The first piece of legislation, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act, was introduced by my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER) on March 1, 2011, and went through committee

markup in the Financial Services Committee last week on March 9. The second bill, H.R. 839, the Home Affordable Modification Program Termination Act, was introduced by my dear friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) on February 28 and marked up last week as well.

Both of these bills went through regular order, which allowed Members from both sides of the aisle the opportunity to offer amendments in the Financial Services Committee and in the Rules Committee yesterday.

The chairman of the Rules Committee, DAVID DREIER, has once again provided Members of this body a transparent and accountable structure under the rule that we are discussing today, allowing Members from both sides of this body to offer amendments and both sides to join in debate of the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last fall, Republicans pledged to the American people that we would stop the wasteful spending and put Americans back to work. These two bills that we're discussing today continue to roll back the abuse of taxpayer funds, the diminishment of jobs, and the creation of a proper government responsibility with any balance in the housing sector.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we also said that we would make sure that we went through regular order and would allow Members time to read the bills. That is what Republicans bring forth to the floor today as we debate these two important aspects that have gone through regular order through the Financial Services Committee.

H.R. 861, the NSP Termination Act, terminates the Neighborhood Stability Program and rescinds \$1 billion in unobligated funds that was authorized in the Dodd-Frank bill last year.

Congress has appropriated approximately \$7 billion in three rounds of funding for this program. Eligible users for the funds include emergency assistance to State and local governments to acquire, develop, redevelop, or demolish foreclosed homes. So this doesn't stop or assist folks in getting through foreclosures. It gives money to lenders to fix up the houses to sell, while returning not one cent of the \$7 billion back to the American taxpayer.

The NSP has done little to resolve the root causes of the increase in foreclosures. In fact, the NSP continues to extend and further exacerbate the current housing downturn. This program represents a costly bailout for lenders, servicers, and real estate speculators who made risky bets on the housing market, all at the expense of the American taxpayer and our debt.

While putting billions of taxpayer dollars at risk, we should understand that this is a program, two programs that must be halted. There should be an appropriate accountability and reporting, and this program lacks both. This is just another two examples, following up what we did last week with two other examples, of the Democrats'

solution of throwing money at a problem rather than something that would work and be cost effective.

Taxpayers from all over this Nation are struggling with their mortgage payments, keeping their jobs, and providing for their families. Allowing for a stable economy, a future, and reining in government spending by eliminating wasteful government spending will provide for more transparency and government accountability across economic markets. That is why we are eliminating these two programs today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Let's be honest about this. Republicans are here to try and save jobs that are on the chopping block from what wasteful government spending has done for us the last 4 years of Democrat control. Today, Republicans are on the floor to stop wasteful Washington government spending, which says directly to the taxpayers we don't want 40 cents out of every dollar that we spend to be put on a credit card, a future debt that our children and our future will be put at risk by mortgaging our future. Republicans are not going to allow that. That is why we're on the floor of the House of Representatives. That is why we will encourage every Member of this body, Republican or Democrat, to make tough decisions today about not just today, but about our future.

The second bill under this rule today, H.R. 839, rescinds the Home Affordable Modification Program known as HAMP. This is another unnecessarily and poorly managed housing program that wastes tens of billions of dollars of taxpayer dollars. Terminating this program would prevent the use of \$29 billion of TARP funds, \$29 billion of TARP funds we do not think should be spent.

HAMP was established in February of 2009 with the goal of assisting with loan modifications for up to 4 million homeowners. Over the life of this program, only 521,306 loans have been permanently modified, and the redefault rate for these loans is very high.

□ 1240

So what we started with is trying to help 4 million people. Thus far, we have only helped 521,000, but it comes at a high cost to the taxpayer. Only \$840 million of the \$29 billion earmarked for this purpose has been used—only \$800 million of the \$29 billion.

We need the money back, Mr. Speaker. We need the money back because this is another case in which the program actually made matters worse for many of the homeowners who were seeking to participate. The government is pushing a program which harms these homeowners. It creates a perverse incentive for borrowers to deliberately and willfully stop making their mortgage payments in the hopes that they can get government loans to reduce their payments.

This program that the government has actually encourages people to quit

making payments, which still add up, including the interest on what they owe. It harms their credit ratings and adds, what I think, is a further unfair circumstance in which the government is pushing "we're here to help you" when, in fact, it doesn't know the rules of the game or whether a homeowner will even be able to qualify, making the homeowner wait months to then find out, "Whoops. Sorry. You didn't qualify. Now you need to continue what you're doing."

A false hope, Mr. Speaker.

The Washington Times, which is a great newspaper here in Washington, published an article on this program on March 1 of this year. It stated that in, perhaps, hundreds of thousands of cases, homeowners are far worse off after HAMP than they were before being talked into and getting involved with the program. Borrowers are typically not told all the potential consequences of falling behind on their mortgages. They're simply told that there's a government plan out there to help you when, in fact, they do fall behind on their mortgages.

Services have repeatedly lost documentation and have provided false information to home borrowers who were in need of assistance and good discussion about how to pay their bills—instead, trying to talk them into participating in a government program and, in some instances, even pushing individuals into default, individuals who could have continued making their payments.

In a report from the Inspector General of TARP to Secretary of the Treasury Geithner on March 25, 2010—that is 1 year ago—he notes: "Several aspects of the HAMP design make it particularly vulnerable to redefaults."

It is time to pull the plug. That is why Republicans are on the floor today to say straight up: We need to look at what is not working. We need to look at the \$29 billion that has been spent on this program, and we need to be honest with ourselves, as has been noted in newspapers across the country, as to what the Democrats have done. What this administration and this House have done has been adversarial in helping people who needed assistance. Today, we can save the taxpayers \$28 billion that has not been spent on this program.

Continued government intervention and the questionable use of taxpayer dollars only prolong our current economic crisis and ensure that the housing market will simply continue to struggle. The market needs to find its own footing free of government intervention and manipulation by this government so that we can get on with a full recovery. The deficit is expected to reach a record under President Obama: using his numbers, \$1.65 trillion this year while our national debt is well over \$14 trillion. The U.S. and its citizens cannot afford to spend billions of taxpayer dollars that will not be repaid, and it ends up, in many instances,

harming the people it was intended to help.

Job creation is the most effective foreclosure prevention tool. Job losses rather than unsustainable mortgage terms are now the driving force behind foreclosures and mortgage defaults. Eliminating these programs will not only save taxpayer dollars; it will encourage more responsible government spending by the Federal Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, as no surprise to you, I encourage a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we are again. At a time when Americans are calling for more jobs to improve the economy, my Republican colleagues want to pass legislation that won't create a single job and that will hurt the middle class by further destabilizing our housing markets.

Mr. Speaker, this week, we take up two more bills to continue weakening our housing markets and abandoning families who are working hard, struggling to stay in their homes, both of which show that my friends on the other side of the aisle continue to put partisan politics ahead of creating jobs and growing the economy.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, when we had several Members there from both sides who were testifying, the question was asked: Are we in a housing crisis? Everybody there agreed—and I think most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and on my side of the aisle agreed as well—that we are in a housing crisis. So the answer is: What is and what should be the response?

Now, this response is what we have.

My colleague from Dallas said that the current program, HAMP, lacks accountability. Well, it seems like the logical answer to that would be to create accountability for the program, not to eliminate the program. We are talking about repeal without replace. We are talking about ending rather than mending. If there is truly a housing crisis, as I believe Members across both sides of the aisle agree there is, it calls for a public policy response. Rather than talking about what we shouldn't do, I think it would be more constructive to talk about what we should do.

We are leaving nothing in the wake if this proposed repeal moves forward. At a time when our economy is finally beginning to show signs of strong, sustained growth, we need to do everything we can to put people back to work and create jobs. Instead, here we have legislation after legislation that will increase burdens on already struggling middle class families. Rather than improving and building upon or even replacing programs that keep families in their homes, the Republicans have chosen to eliminate these four programs that keep families in their homes, and they have no plan to strengthen the housing market or to

help the families who will, quite literally, be left on the street as a result.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 839 will eliminate one of the last lifelines available to many homeowners. According to Treasury Secretary Geithner, ending the HAMP program would cause a huge amount of damage to a very fragile housing market and would leave hundreds and hundreds of thousands, if not millions of Americans, without the chance to take advantage of mortgage modifications that would allow them to stay in homes that they can afford.

Now, we could go into how we got into this mess in the first place, and we all know, Mr. Speaker, that there is plenty of blame to go around. Yes, people who got in over their heads with mortgages they couldn't afford deserve some of the blame. So do the brokers who shouldn't have sold them on those mortgages. So do the banks that underwrote those mortgages. So does Wall Street for packaging those mortgages and creating derivative products—and yes, so does the government for being asleep at the regulatory switch. There is plenty of blame to go around.

When the bankers needed help, they came to the government, and the government helped them. When the regulators needed help, they came to the government, and we passed financial regulatory reform last year. Well, the people who are most affected, the people who literally risk being tossed out on the street, rely on these programs to help them. How in good conscience can this Congress even consider bailing out Wall Street and bankers and not help mainstream America stay in their homes?

Yes, there is plenty of blame to go around. Believe me, many of these people facing this situation, who are barely able to make their mortgages, are not being rewarded for their bad decisions. They would much rather spend half as much on homes and not be under water, suffering as they are today. Yet the least we can do as a country to help them is to acknowledge that, yes, personal responsibility and blame don't just fall on their shoulders.

My Republican colleagues will argue that this is a failed government program and that this program hasn't helped the 3 million to 4 million homeowners it was originally projected to help. What they fail to mention is that HAMP, A, has helped to stabilize the housing market and that, B, it has helped over half a million families. Yes, that's not the 3 million or 4 million, and yes, our side of the aisle would be very open to suggestions about improving this program, whether it's the accountability of this program, the scale of this program, how it's delivered, or whether it's replacing it with another program to help those who are barely able to make their mortgage payments.

□ 1250

But what we are talking about today is to eliminate the tool that has kept one-half million American families in their homes, Mr. Speaker.

There is no doubt that many folks on the other side of the aisle are also calling this program a waste of taxpayer money. According to the CBO, the average cost per assisted homeowner in HAMP is \$13,000. Now, that is a small price and actually a sound investment. It is far smaller than the \$60,000 that it has been estimated to cost Freddie, Fannie, and large banks to foreclose on a home. So \$13,000 to prevent the banks from foreclosing on a home, keeping that family in a home, allowing them to go to work and make their payments and pay back what is due; or, \$60,000 to foreclose on that home and leave that family on the streets. The money for this program is well spent.

If an individual shows they can't stay current on their programs, they are removed from HAMP at no cost to taxpayers. In fact, of the homeowners that have had their trial modifications cancelled through the end of 2010, only 5.1 percent have been foreclosed on, and only 14.9 percent are at all in the foreclosure process.

Mr. Speaker, the program keeps families in their homes. Mortgages that have been modified under HAMP have a sustainability rate of 85 percent. Yes, we can do better. Yes, we would love to bring this program or others to keep 3 million to 4 million families in their home and stabilize housing prices. But what the bill before us does is repeal one of the only tools we have to help keep American families in their homes.

I understand the program hasn't reached the initial projections that the Obama administration put forward. But there is no question, talking to some of the families that this program has benefited, that it does work for them. With our help, the Treasury can continue to take steps to improve the effectiveness of this program and increase compliance from banks and borrowers.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 861 would rightly be titled the "Illegal Trade Commercial Real Estate Act." The majority seeks to undermine the efforts of our Nation's mayors, city councils, and real estate developers and ensure that areas which have suffered due to economic downturn remain safely in control of those who do damage to communities. This is a critical program to help reform our communities.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which I remind my colleagues was established and signed into law by President Bush, was designed to turn a crisis into an opportunity. In 2008, almost \$4 billion was appropriated and helped 307 State and local agencies acquire, rehabilitate, and sell abandoned and foreclosed properties, exactly what is most needed now not only to revitalize our blighted areas but to help prevent the housing crisis and commercial real estate crisis from getting

worse. I remind my colleagues that every dime of this program that is not spent by the sunset of this program will already, under statute, be returned to the Treasury.

By creating a mechanism for communities to acquire, rehabilitate, and sell back to the private market abandoned and blighted properties, we give local governments a very powerful tool for economic growth and fighting crime and keeping our communities safe.

In the midst of our ongoing liquidity crisis, where many developers are having a tough time finding financing for many of their prime projects, it is a matter of public safety and critical economic importance that we continue this vehicle by which blighted properties are returned to being productive economic engines, particularly in our Nation's most troubled neighborhoods.

I also want to point out that this program isn't limited to commercial property. In my district in Adams County, Colorado, which like other areas of the country was devastated by the wave of foreclosures, we have used this program to revitalize residential neighborhoods. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program allows local governments to build communities with home rehabilitation, down payment and closing cost assistance for low- and middle-income families. By using these Federal dollars to leverage local efforts, many struggling families have been able to find and keep a home, and a modest Federal investment has been magnified severalfold by private investment, city investment, and county investment.

Mr. Speaker, I think most people in this country agree, yes, there is a housing crisis and, yes, there is plenty of blame to go around and, yes, we need a public policy response. These programs aren't perfect. We hope to work in a bipartisan way with our colleagues across the aisle on improving these programs, coming up with new market-oriented programs to help end the crisis in real estate. But the answer is not to simply repeal one of the only instruments that we have to keep families in their homes with only the vaguest of assurances that someday, somehow Congress might think up a better plan.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments about our being here today on the floor in a bipartisan way with a bill that went through regular order with an opportunity for any Member that would choose that has any ideas that are germane to the issue and that fall within the rules to be included. And you are going to see where there are a bunch of amendments today.

Mr. Speaker, the conversation that the gentleman and I were having should further extend, and that is the common sense that is related to why we are on the floor today, the discussion about whether we should make it better or simply repeal it. And I would quote from the IG of the TARP fund in his report to Secretary Geithner:

"Although in the final analysis it is up to the policymakers in the administration and the Congress to determine whether it is worth spending tens of billions of taxpayer dollars on a program that is assumed at its outset to fail ultimately for 40 percent of the participants, several aspects of HAMP's design make it particularly vulnerable to redefaults."

I think the IG has said it best. When any objective person looked at what the Democrat Congress passed, they would have to question whether it was worth spending tens of billions of dollars on a program at the outset we should have known would fail for 40 percent of the participants. I think that is good reason to say, common sense should say, let's stop the plan, not continue it.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of House Resolution 170, the rule for consideration of H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, NSP, Termination Act, and H.R. 839, the Home Affordable Program (HAMP) Termination Act. H.R. 861 would end NSP and rescind 1 billion taxpayer dollars that would otherwise be spent to continue this troubled program.

In total, Congress has already spent \$7 billion for NSP. And instead of stabilizing neighborhoods or helping people whose mortgages are underwater, the program allows lenders and servicers to offload their bad investments onto taxpayers and delay market recovery. Even more disturbing is that critics warn that NSP creates incentives for banks and other lenders to foreclose on troubled borrowers, worsening the crisis and kicking families out of their homes.

This program is not about helping homeowners. They have already lost their house to foreclosure. They are not involved in this. This is help for lenders and bankers to take the money and build more homes through the counties, through the States, through not-for-profits, and then to sell these homes and reap the benefits of the money. There is no place in this bill to tell us where that money goes. It probably is in a slush fund.

The GAO, the inspector general for HUD, and other auditors have noted the program is plagued with problems, including lax reporting requirements and poor accountability. There is little evidence to suggest that the funds spent through NSP are producing cost-effective results.

Finally, the program lacks any requirement that remaining NSP funds are returned to taxpayers when a sponsored property is sold. Instead, the money is treated like a fund, somewhere, never to be returned.

The other bill approved by our committee is H.R. 839. This bill would ter-

minate HAMP, which has become the poster child for failed foreclosure mitigation programs. According to the CBO, this bill would save \$1.4 billion over 10 years.

Announced by the Obama administration in February of 2009, the HAMP program to date has spent \$840 million out of the \$30 billion in TARP funds that were set aside for the program. For this extraordinary investment, the administration predicted that up to 4 million homeowners would receive help. Instead, only 580,000 homeowners have received mortgage modifications.

Sadly, a failure to meet expectations is the least of the program's troubles. Of those who were promised help, 740,000 homeowners have had their modifications cancelled. In many cases, these homeowners were strung along on a false hope, only to end up in worse financial straits than if they had never heard of HAMP.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a statement from a March 2 subcommittee hearing during which Neil Barofsky, the Special Inspector General for the TARP program, or SIGTARP, exposed the most hazardous failings of the program. He said that there had been countless published reports on HAMP participants who wound up worse off, having engaged in a false attempt. Failed modifications often leave borrowers with more principal outstanding on their loans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would like to yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Numerous oversight bodies, including the GAO, have cited the Treasury for failing to respond to recommendations to increase the transparency, accountability, and consistency of the program. Americans for Tax Reform called the program "a costly failure."

Out-of-control spending has left us with a \$14.1 trillion national debt that is damaging our recovery and harming job growth. Economists agree that reducing government spending will create a more favorable environment for private sector jobs; and that is what Americans need, a job and a paycheck, not more failed experiments and taxpayer-funded housing.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today really troubled because I am opposed to terminating the HAMP program and the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. But I am troubled because these programs have actually been very troubled. They are not perfect. They haven't helped every homeowner that we want, but we shouldn't be in a position of just destroying the programs.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program in particular was established to help communities acquire, rehabilitate, and resell abandoned and foreclosed properties as a result of the growing foreclosure crisis. There are so many economists across this country who tell us every single day that until we get the housing market straight, we will not get this economy straight. So I believe in theory in these programs.

Declining home values in my community have led to lower tax revenues for our local jurisdictions that are already suffering from the impacts of the economic downturn. The statewide foreclosure crisis has hit particularly hard in my district and the counties that I represent, in Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, in Maryland. They have the first and third highest number of foreclosures in our State and account for 40 percent of the foreclosures statewide.

Through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, Montgomery County received \$2 million and Prince George's County nearly \$12 million in funding. This has helped in these communities. I would urge the majority to look at the benefits, and let's try to fix the programs.

At the beginning of this crisis, sure, there were bad loans. There were bad actors all over the place. But we also know that people have lost their jobs and that has contributed to foreclosures, and these families should not be punished because we can't seem to get it straight. Neighborhood stabilization does stabilize communities. It doesn't do any good to have homes that are empty and in decline and neighborhoods that will never bring the market back.

So while I am concerned about some of the programs and would like to work to try to fix these, it is not right for us to simply throw them out and minimize the impact of helping 521,000 families to stay in their homes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Cherryville, North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the author of one of the pieces of underlying legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I am sponsoring is the HAMP Termination Act, and it is a bill that will protect at-risk homeowners across the country from a government program that has proven to be an abysmal failure.

The Home Affordable Modification Program, or HAMP, was originally supposed to help as many as 3 million to 4 million struggling homeowners avoid foreclosure by modifying loans to a level that is affordable to borrowers now and sustainable over the long term. That was the intention. However, nearly 800,000 of the 1.4 million homeowners who enrolled in this program have subsequently been rejected or terminated.

In his most recent testimony to Congress, the Special Inspector General for

TARP, Neil Barofsky, stated: "It is just not working. The Home Affordable Modification Program has to date been a failure." "A failure," in the words of the independent individual to oversee this program. A failure.

Now, there is no doubt that people of good will created this program. There is no doubt about that. The intention was to help those that are facing foreclosure. That was the intention.

Unfortunately, the design of this program has led to more people being harmed than actually helped. Understand that. We have a government program that harms more people than it was designed to help because it strings them along with a so-called verbally modified change to their payments, and so it drains their savings. At the end of the day, the majority of the people enrolled in this program are kicked out, and they are left not only with their savings depleted, which is bad enough that a government program strings people along for that, but it also ruins their credit rating, because this government program only verbally modifies their loan terms.

In the end, you have folks that have depleted their savings, ruined their credit, and lost their house. And this is a Federal Government program paid for by the American people's tax dollars. It is an abject failure. Worse than that, it is destroying people's lives.

I would ask my colleagues to vote for this rule. It allows for a number of amendments, some of which are wise, others that I think are very flawed from my colleagues across the aisle.

But this HAMP program, we have to come to a consensus on it. All the folks that oversee this, nonpartisan, bipartisan, have all looked at this and described it as a failure.

So if we can't eliminate this government program, then I ask my colleagues, What government programs can we eliminate? Vote for the rule; and, please, I ask my colleagues to vote for the HAMP Termination Act as well.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE).

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. You are right, it is all about debt. Debt. Our homeowners, they are very concerned about debt. It may not be the Federal debt that their grandchildren may have to pay decades from now, but it is definitely that mortgage payment that is due next month. That is the debt that our homeowners cannot afford to pay.

So here is what I am asking this Congress to do: hold off on cutting back on these foreclosure initiatives before we directly help our homeowners. And we can help them in a way that won't cost much more money.

As a matter of fact, let's give homeowners something that they typically don't have when they are facing foreclosure, and that is time. Time. Time to find a home buyer to pay off their mortgage; time to get more income to pay off their bills; and, most importantly, the time and the leverage to

voluntarily negotiate with a mortgage servicer that typically will keep losing their loan modification papers until the homeowner runs out of time. Time.

I am asking this Congress to first do this: freeze all foreclosures to those homeowners who deserve the help and who can afford to stay in their homes and maintain their homes. That is the best way to stop our property values from dropping, from providing the revenue that our police officers and firefighters and emergency medical providers definitely need; and, finally, that is the best way to help save family homes, by providing time to our homeowners.

□ 1310

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for the time.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act, NSP.

We keep hearing from the other side about wasteful government spending. Nothing represents wasteful government spending more than the continuing billions and billions of dollars of taxpayer money that we give to Big Oil, which is making record profits. This bill continues the Republican assault on the middle class and the working people.

For the sake of our communities, we cannot afford to terminate NSP. By redeveloping foreclosed and abandoned properties, this program is stabilizing neighborhoods nationwide. This not only increases property values but also reduces the number of foreclosures. NSP provides a lifeline to struggling families who are trying to secure affordable housing or simply stay in their homes.

Like the rest of the country, Hawaii has a foreclosure crisis. We rank 10th in the Nation in the rate of foreclosures. The \$19.6 million in NSP funding that Hawaii received is helping our communities in the greatest need throughout my State. The City and County of Honolulu will use these funds to redevelop vacant properties and build two affordable rental housing projects in Ewa and Waianae. In Hawaii County, an affordable rental housing project will be built on vacant property in Kailua-Kona. In the counties of Maui and Kauai, NSP funds will be used to buy and rehabilitate abandoned or foreclosed homes and residential properties throughout both counties.

So you can see that this is money that is not represented as wasteful spending. Our communities need our help. Vote against this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we began this week, there were 15 million unemployed Americans looking for this Congress to work together to try to get something done for entrepreneurs and small businesses to create jobs. What has the Congress done? Yesterday, the majority managed, only with the help of a few dozen Democrats, to keep the government running for the next 3 weeks because they couldn't agree among themselves as to what to do with the budget. Today, they're taking up this bill that, rather than fixing a flawed program, they rip it up from the roots and throw it out. Tomorrow, they're going to pull the plug on National Public Radio.

Now, I would suggest if you're like some of those 15 million Americans who are spending the day at the public library in front of Monster.com or looking at the want ads in the newspapers, wearing out your shoe leather to figure out where your next job is going to come from, this has not been a great week. Eleven weeks the majority has been in control—no jobs bill, no jobs plan, no jobs idea. Not one word, not one bill, not one minute.

The priorities of this majority are wrong.

Republicans and Democrats should come together, work together to create an environment where small businesses and entrepreneurs can create jobs for the American people. Eleven weeks—no jobs, no sense of priorities. That's the record of this majority.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I was just reminded by the gentleman, Mr. MICA, the favorite son of Florida, who's the chairman of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) had referred that we've done nothing about jobs. But the gentleman, Mr. MICA, as chairman of the committee reminded me that this House passed just 2 weeks ago a transportation bill that had been lagging, waiting since 2009, that will add a substantial number of jobs. And that was a good jobs bill.

So I wouldn't expect to get credit for anything, necessarily, on the floor, but at least we need to be honest about this. The Republicans did pass a bill that was adding jobs as opposed to this massive undertaking that we are trying to save jobs that are at risk as a result of the outlandish spending and wasteful government spending taking place here.

Secondly, the gentleman said, Why are Republicans now trying to get rid of this? Why didn't we do something to fix the program? But I would remind the American people that this is a report that went to the Secretary of the Treasury over a year ago. And I would ask the question: Why did the Democrats, why did this administration con-

tinue a failed program? Why did they continue it? That's because they were happy with it. In fact, as we've already read, a 40 percent failure rate and thousands of more people harmed. That's why Republicans are trying to fix this—because we have tried to work.

Today, we're going to pass this on the floor. It's a great bill. And we're going to ask every single person to be able to vote for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

I want to agree with my friend from Texas that investing in transportation construction creates jobs. We agree with him. And I would ask the gentleman if he would support our Build America bill that offsets the deficit by cutting job outsources and creates more transportation construction jobs. Would he agree to put that on the floor?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. As soon as it's on the floor, I'll consider that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, we'll give the gentleman a chance on the previous question motion, perhaps tomorrow.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would point out that the one bill that the gentleman from Texas has pointed to as a jobs bill is one bill that contained many, many earmarks from previous sessions. Also included is continuing funding for a bridge to nowhere in Alaska. So if this is the best jobs bill that a Republican Congress can bring forward, I think the American people deserve better.

It is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 861, which would terminate all funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. The program has really helped families and communities in Alabama's Seventh Congressional District tremendously.

Our Nation is recovering from one of the worst recessions experienced in our lifetime, and in my district, the economic downturn happened long before the rest of the Nation began to experience it. The foreclosure rate in my district has reached 8 percent. These foreclosures have devastated homeowners. The foreclosures have had a debilitating effect on the neighborhoods, leading to blight, decay, and reduced property values.

The NSP program provides States and hard-hit cities with program funding to help them recover from the effects of foreclosures, abandoned properties, and declining property values. The City of Birmingham, the City of Bessemer, Jefferson County, and the State of Alabama have received funding from this program. In my district, the NSP program has revitalized 259

homes, relocated 69 families, and has saved at least nine distressed neighborhoods.

In speaking recently with the mayor of the City of Birmingham, Mayor Bell, about the effectiveness of this program, he informed me that the program has benefited greatly distressed neighborhoods in Birmingham. I've also heard from families whose neighborhoods have been improved because of this funding.

My colleagues across the aisle want to terminate NSP, but I respectfully disagree. There's still much work to be done for our families and our communities. Without a doubt, we must reduce our national budget and Congress must work together to make the tough cuts. However, such cuts cannot be made on the backs of our communities, families, and seniors.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker and my friends on both sides of the aisle, we could very easily come up with money to save this program if we would just put a windfall profits tax on the oil companies.

I'm here today to point out the critical importance of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to urge my fellow Members to vote against cancelling it.

Over the past decade, the people of my State in Ohio, and my district in particular, have weathered a terrible storm of foreclosures, devastating entire communities. While some neighborhoods in my district have been hollowed out by the effects of this storm, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds have made neighborhoods and communities safer. Those communities faced the constant risk of crime and vandals taking advantage of empty structures, and Neighborhood Stabilization funds have been used to demolish hundreds of abandoned homes in the neighborhood, to help protect existing home values, and prevented neighborhoods from falling apart.

But the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has not just financed demolition of abandoned structures. In Cuyahoga County alone, this program funded the creation of 237 units of affordable rental housing and 25 single-family home renovations and neighborhood green space improvements.

□ 1320

It has also been used to leverage non-Federal money to fund the innovative Land Bank, a public entity that buys vacant and abandoned land and puts ownership of that land back in the hands of the public so that it can be used again, often in conjunction with private development, to renew and revitalize communities. Anyone who has ever spent any time in blighted communities knows that they cry out for

innovative solutions like the Land Bank.

When NSP was first being developed, I held hearings to find out how specifically HUD planned to allocate the funds. I convinced them of the wisdom of using U.S. Postal Service and census tract data on residential home vacancies. Because of that, they adopted a need-based formula for allocating the money to neighborhoods and communities that needed it most.

Vote against this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are facing a CR of \$61 billion in cuts causing the loss of 800,000 jobs. What is more precious to America than the opportunity to own a home?

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program has gone into inner city and urban areas and recaptured neighborhoods, giving them a boost of energy that they needed. There is always the opportunity for reform, Mr. Speaker, but I would simply raise the question: Let's mend it, don't end it. Let's not leave cities abandoned with broken down, ramshackle homes that would in fact create more blight, more gang opportunities, more dangerous conditions.

And, yes, HAMP needs reform. But what does it mean to eliminate a program? Of course the HAMP has a grandfather provision. But all America wants is to get these programs to work. Neighborhood stabilization works. HAMP can work. Now you're letting banks off the hook, so that every day a homeowner calls, they can hear the sound "foreclosed." At least the intervention allowed those hardworking Americans to keep their home and to provide for their family and to keep jobs will be lost if these bills are passed. Vote no.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to the bill to end the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. It is time for Americans to seriously question the Republican leadership's dedication to job creation. After 11 weeks in Congress, they've offered no jobs plan, no jobs bill.

What's worse, by their own expert witness's testimony, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, or NSP, supports 93,000 jobs nationally. In light of this estimate, I submitted an amendment to the NSP Termination Act that would require the Congressional Budget Office to study and report to Congress the impact of this legislation on job creation or job loss. However, my friends on the other side of the aisle

prevented consideration of my amendment on the floor of the House.

Last week, the Republicans waged an attack on American homeowners by voting to eliminate foreclosure mitigation programs that help underwater homeowners refinance their mortgage as well as assist temporarily unemployed Americans to remain current on their mortgage; all of this in the midst of one of the worst housing crises in the history of America. And now the Republicans are putting our most vulnerable communities at even greater risk. Terminating the Neighborhood Stabilization Program will damage our neighborhoods, devastate home values, and will slow our economic recovery.

Now is the time to protect our most vulnerable neighborhoods, families who are struggling, and now is the time to invest in the future of our communities and help to restore the American dream of homeownership, recognizing that stabilization of our housing market is key to our economic recovery.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the termination of this program. I've seen it work in Rhode Island. It's worked well. It's making a difference.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, once again, my friends and colleagues are talking about a no jobs bill, nothing about jobs. But at least there's a purist on the floor and, that is, there was one Democrat in the House who voted against the Republican jobs bill, transportation bill. That was the gentleman, Mr. POLIS. So I would think that he would have great standing on saying we've never had a bill that added jobs, but everybody else I would have to question that because they voted for the bill, because, in fact, it's a good jobs bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With regard to the jobs bill, I acknowledge that that was the bill that my colleague from Texas cited as the one jobs bill the Republicans have brought before us. This was a bill that had dozens and dozens of earmarks, which is why, in standing with President Obama, I opposed that bill, including an indefensible earmark on which we proposed an amendment on the floor, which was voted down, I might add, without a single Republican vote, to eliminate funding for what I thought there was broad consensus we should eliminate funding for; namely, a \$300 million bridge in Alaska. There was a \$70 million bridge to an island with 50 people, and an additional project that is another bridge.

This is an example of earmarks at their worst, of pork barrel politics at their worst. I'm beginning to think if the Republicans do come up with a job bill, we need to ask at what price jobs? Is it going to be so filled up with Republican pork that we have to either take it or leave it? That's a choice the American people don't want to face.

Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to admit that we can improve HAMP. We

can improve the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. There's no doubt about that. I would advance that we should be doing exactly that. My colleague from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE) had some excellent ideas about improving these programs. I am a cosponsor of a bill to provide for a capital gains tax exemption for investment in community banks to help them shore up their balance sheets. Why not look at, for instance, allowing investment properties to have the same mortgage deductibility as primary residences? There's a number of great ideas that I'm sure Members on both sides of the aisle could discuss and agree upon to address our housing crisis. But what the answer isn't is to repeal one of the only tools we have and to replace it with silence.

It is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to use an example here from a district in northeast Ohio, an old industrial district. We've had chronic foreclosures for 30 years. The census just came out. The city of Youngstown went from 180,000 people down to about 65,000 people. The tax base has been eroded. And in the last few years, Youngstown has been cited as one of the top 10 best cities to start a business by Entrepreneur magazine. Site Selection magazine says it's one of the top 10 places to start or grow a business.

In part, the renaissance of Youngstown is because of Federal investments like this that help us downsize and shrink our community. And I find it ironic that our friends who are trying to reduce government spending, we're trying to get rid of dilapidated housing where it increases crime, prostitution, drug use. This all puts more pressure on the safety services within a town like Youngstown.

This bill to repeal this money is actually going to cost cities and rural areas more money because you're not allowing us to reinvest into these places, downsize them, shrink them, make them more manageable and, over time, reduce the tax burden on the local taxpayer. These are critical investments that are needed in the United States of America. This should have been \$5 billion, not just \$1 billion.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, if it worked that way, we'd be for it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman to respond.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would invite the gentleman to Youngstown, Ohio. He can see it for himself.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado who serves on the Financial Services Committee, Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from Colorado.

I would invite my friend from Texas to come to Aurora, Colorado, where we've actually, with the Neighborhood

Stabilization Program, had tremendous successes. This country was on its back financially 2 years ago, 2½ years ago. We're just now getting back on our feet, and my friends from the Republican side of the aisle want to just pull the rug right back out. You've got to get strong before you can do away with some of these programs.

So let's talk about Aurora, Colorado. They got \$4.7 million to go and buy homes that were vacant because there had been foreclosures which were causing blight and lots of property devaluation. They went in, fixed the homes, and sold them to good families. The neighborhood starts growing again. Aurora has taken that \$4.7 million and turned it into \$7.8 million by the sales of these properties, so that the neighborhoods get strengthened, families are helped, and we stop this cycle of foreclosure in tough neighborhoods.

□ 1330

My friends on the Republican side of the aisle are blaming all sorts of things for the debt that have nothing to do with it and are taking away things that are really helping middle America. I'd urge them to rethink this whole bill, and I know my friend from Colorado has seen these same things, the benefits of these programs.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I will assure the gentleman I will be in Aurora, Colorado, and I'll be pleased to be there this year and probably next year, also.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get some items on the schedule for the gentleman from Dallas during his visit to Colorado as well.

I'm the last speaker for my side, and I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any further requests for time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the gentleman's asking. I have no further requests for time, and I appreciate the collegiality the gentleman has extended me.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you a few stories from constituents in my district that the HAMP program has helped. My office has helped a number of constituents with this program, and I'm not alone in doing that.

Last year, I had a local artist who ran her own small business contact my office asking for help with her mortgage. Her income had declined significantly and unexpectedly due to the tough economy. She tried to find a second job but it wasn't enough. With the help of a HAMP loan modification, she's still in her home today.

We also helped a truckdriver who had become ill and needed dialysis. Although he still receives Social Security, he couldn't afford his mortgage payments without his old salary. He had nowhere else to turn, but with the HAMP modification, he was able to lower his interest rate by 2 percent and convert his loan from an adjustable

rate to a 30-year fixed and stay in his home.

Mr. Speaker, the stories don't end there. HAMP has proven that it can save families on the brink of foreclosure and keep them there for the long haul. It's not the ideal program. It hasn't reached the 3 million families that were initially projected, but you ask any of those 500,000 families that HAMP has helped keep in their home and they will agree that this program works for them.

Mr. Speaker, we should be focusing on jobs. Last month, I'm proud to say, our economy added over 150,000 private sector jobs, and instead of working to increase that number, we've been passing legislation that threatens to reverse the progress that has been made by creating additional uncertainty within the real estate sector and leaving more families at risk of losing their homes.

Republicans promised to promote job creation and economic growth with their new majority. Instead of delivering on these promises, they've already used their majority to raise taxes on middle class Americans, to attack the middle class, and promote their own social agenda. This is not the change that the American people asked for.

It is time to get our fiscal house in order. I'd like to make it clear that this is not the way to solve our budget problems, by repealing a program that helps keep middle class families in their home. Mr. Speaker, the best way to get our deficit under control is through creating jobs, not through cutting the safety net of hardworking Americans and preventing our cities and counties from revitalizing their blighted neighborhoods.

Most distressing, however, is that through these bills the promise of job creation is broken yet again. I ask my colleagues to join me and vote "no" on this rule and "no" on the underlying legislation so we can keep our promise to help all of our communities rebuild and succeed, and work in a bipartisan fashion to get the very best ideas on the table about what our proper public policy response should be with regard to the housing crisis and the jobs crisis that this Nation faces.

I ask for a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for not only engaging in a spirited debate here on floor but also for his collegiality in that endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is being overrun still by too high a taxation, borrowing, and spending, and just last month, we hit a record deficit, \$223 billion in 1 month. That is simply unacceptable. With the debt looming at over \$14 trillion and unemployment hovering still around 9 percent, Americans want solutions, not handouts. And that is why we are here on the floor today, to protect the taxpayer and the

integrity, I think, of the government, rather than creating more problems, at least trying to alleviate some of those and give the taxpayer back some money. The American people asked Congress to rein in spending and for efficiency, and that is what Republicans are here to do today.

We did this in an open process where every single Member of this body had a chance through regular order to prepare themselves and to come to the floor today. Since Republicans have gained the majority in January we have cut \$1.2 trillion worth of spending, first of all, by repealing ObamaCare; secondly, by cutting \$61 billion in H.R. 1, \$8 billion last week in additional unnecessary government housing programs, and another \$30 billion with this rule today. We're getting our job done.

By gaining control of government spending and eliminating wasteful government handouts, the private sector can, again, gain confidence in our economy and the direction of the future of this country to begin investing in jobs and our economic future. After all, we finally decided last year that what we would do is extend tax cuts which will help save jobs and grow our economy.

I applaud my colleagues for introducing the bills we are discussing here today. In just a few minutes, you will see the chairman of the Financial Services Committee or his designee lead that discussion through lots of amendments, lots of ideas by Members.

I want to thank the young chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, DAVID DREIER, for providing us such a great, open, and transparent process. I encourage a "yes" vote on the rule and perhaps, more importantly, on the resolution before us today.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 180, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—241

Adams	Bilbray	Calvert
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Camp
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Campbell
Alexander	Black	Canseco
Altmire	Blackburn	Cantor
Amash	Bonner	Capito
Austria	Bono Mack	Carter
Bachmann	Boustany	Cassidy
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barletta	Brooks	Chaffetz
Bartlett	Broun (GA)	Coble
Barton (TX)	Buchanan	Coffman (CO)
Bass (NH)	Bucshon	Cole
Benishek	Buerkle	Conaway
Berg	Burgess	Cravaack
Biggert	Burton (IN)	Crawford

Crenshaw Johnson (IL) Reed Lofgren, Zoe Pelosi Serrano
Culberson Johnson (OH) Rehberg Lowey Perlmutter Sewell
Davis (KY) Johnson, Sam Reichert Lujan Peters Sherman
Denham Jones Renacci Lynch Peterson Sires
Dent Ribble Maloney Pingree (ME) Slaughter
DesJarlais Kelly Markley Polis Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart King (IA) Matheson Price (NC) Speier
Dold King (NY) Rivera Quigley Stark
Dreier Kingston Roe (TN) Rahall Sutton
Duffy Kinginger (IL) Rangel Thompson (CA)
Duncan (SC) Kline McDermott Reyes Thompson (MS)
Duncan (TN) Lamborn McGovern Richardson Tierney
Ellmers Lance Rohrabacher Richmond Tonko
Emerson Landry Rokita Ross (AR) Towns
Farenthold Rankford Meeks Rothman (NJ) Tsongas
Fincher Latham Michaud Roybal-Allard Van Hollen
Fitzpatrick LaTourette Roskam Miller (NC) Velázquez
Flake Latta Ross (FL) Miller, George Rush Visclosky
Fleischmann Lewis (CA) Royce Ryan (OH) Walz (MN)
Fleming LoBiondo Moran Sánchez, Linda Wasserman
Flores Long Ryan (WI) Murphy (CT) T. Schultz
Forbes Lucas Schillig Oliver Sanchez, Loretta Watt
Fortenberry Luetkemeyer Schmidt Olver Sarbanes Waxman
Foxy Lummis Schmitt Owens Schakowsky Weiner
Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel Schock Owens Schiff Welch
Frelinghuysen E. Schweikert Pallone Schrader Wilson (FL)
Gallegly Mack Scott (SC) Pascarell Schwartz Woolsey
Gardner Manzullo Scott, Austin Pastor (AZ) Scott (VA) Wu
Garrett Marchant Sensenbrenner Sessions Smith (NJ) Yarmuth
Gerlach Marino Schick Shinkus Shuler
Gibbs McCarthy (CA) Shuler Shuster
Gibson McCaul Shuster Simpson
Gingrey (GA) McClintock Smith (NE)
Gohmert McCotter Smith (TX)
Goodlatte McKeon Smith (TX) Southerland
Gosar McKinley Smith (TX) Stearns
Gowdy McMorris Southernland Stivers
Granger Rodgers Stivers Stutzman
Graves (GA) Meehan Stearns Stutzman
Graves (MO) Mica Sullivan Terry
Griffin (AR) Miller (FL) Miller, Gary Thompson (PA)
Griffith (VA) Miller (MI) Myrick Thornberry
Grimm Mulvaney Neugebauer Tiberi
Guinta Murphy (PA) Tipton
Guthrie Hall Turner
Hall Myrick Tipton
Hanna Neugebauer Turner
Harper Noem Upton
Harris Nugent Upton
Hartzler Nunes Walberg
Hastings (WA) Nunnelee Walden
Hayworth Olson Walsh (IL)
Heck Palazzo Webster
Heller Paul West
Hensarling Paulsen Westmoreland
Herger Pearce Whitfield
Herrera Beutler Pence Wilson (SC)
Huelskamp Petri Wittman
Huizenga (MI) Pitts Wolf
Hultgren Platts Womack
Hunter Poe (TX) Woodall
Hurt Pompeo Yoder
Inslee Posey Young (AK)
Issa Price (GA) Young (FL)
Jenkins Quayle Young (IN)

NAYS—180

Ackerman Connolly (VA) Grijalva
Andrews Conyers Gutierrez
Baca Cooper Hanabusa
Baldwin Costello Hastings (FL)
Barrow Courtney Heinrich
Bass (CA) Critz Higgins
Becerra Cuellar Himes
Berkley Cummings Hinchey
Berman Davis (CA) Hinojosa
Bishop (GA) Davis (IL) Hirono
Bishop (NY) DeFazio Holden
Blumenauer DeGette Holt
Boren DeLauro Honda
Boswell Deutch Hoyer
Brady (PA) Dicks Israel
Braley (IA) Dingell Jackson (IL)
Brown (FL) Doggett Jackson Lee
Butterfield Donnelly (IN) (TX)
Capps Doyle Johnson (GA)
Capuano Edwards Johnson, E. B.
Carney Ellison Kaptur
Carson (IN) Engel Keating
Castor (FL) Eshoo Kildee
Chandler Farr Kind
Chu Fattah Kissell
Cicilline Filner Kucinich
Clarke (MI) Frank (MA) Larsen (WA)
Clarke (NY) Fudge Larson (CT)
Clay Garamendi Levin
Cleaver Gonzalez Lewis (GA)
Clyburn Green, Al Lipinski
Cohen Green, Gene Loebsock

McCarthy (NY) Meeks
McCollum Meeks
McGovern Michaud
McIntyre Miller (NC)
McNerney Miller, George
Moore Moore
Moran Moran
Murphy (CT) Murphy (CT)
Napolitano Neal
Neal Oliver
Owens Owens
Pallone Pallone
Pascarell Pascarell
Payne Payne
Cardoza Cardoza
Carnahan Carnahan
Costa Costa
Crowley Crowley

NOT VOTING—11

Giffords Giffords
Labrador Labrador
Langevin Langevin
Lee (CA) Lee (CA)

□ 1359

Messrs. FARR and DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ALTMIRE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 16, 2011 at 11:08 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 7.

That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 8.

That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 9.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1400

COMMUNICATION FROM FORMER CONSTITUENT SERVICES REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE JOHN P. SARBANES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Margaret Stephenson, former Constituent Services Representative, the Honorable JOHN P. SARBANES, Member of Congress:

MARCH 9, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the District Court of Maryland for Baltimore County, to appear as a witness in the criminal trial of a third party who contacted Congressman JOHN P. SARBANES' District office.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

MARGARET STEPHENSON,
Former Constituent
Services Representative,
Office of U.S.
Representative John
P. Sarbanes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 861 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NSP TERMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 170 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 861.

□ 1404

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program, with Mr. BASS of New Hampshire in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act, and I commend my colleague Mr. MILLER for introducing this bill that would end NSP.

As I mentioned during the debate on the rule for this bill, in total, Congress has appropriated \$7 billion for NSP. This bill could save taxpayers up to \$1 billion. Instead of stabilizing neighborhoods, NSP allows lenders and servicers to off-load their bad investments onto taxpayers, and some critics point to the hazard of NSP, which actually may speed up foreclosures for families.

If the lenders and servicers know that they can quickly sell a property to a nonprofit or local government with NSP funds, why wouldn't they do this? Why wouldn't they simply evict the homeowner instead of doing a proprietary, private sector-funded modification of the mortgage that would allow the homeowner to keep his home?

This program does not help homeowners facing foreclosure; and the bottom line is that, if the lenders and servicers own a home due to foreclosure—not the taxpayers but these same lenders and servicers—they are responsible for the upkeep, security and eventual sale of that home. Why should the taxpayers pay for this responsibility which rightly belongs to the lender or servicer? They shouldn't.

The GAO, the HUD Inspector General and other auditors have noted that the program is plagued with problems, including lax reporting requirements and poor accountability. There is no evidence to suggest that funds spent through NSP have produced cost-effective results.

Finally, upon the sale of a property, NSP does not require these groups to return the profit to the taxpayer. Instead, the money is treated like a slush fund. This money is never returned to the taxpayer but will stay with the local governments and nonprofit entities that received it. Of course, any group would support keeping the profits of homes sold instead of returning it to the taxpayer. Who wouldn't?

We need to break down barriers that have delayed recovery in the housing market, including expensive and ineffective government programs like NSP. We need to stop funding programs that don't work with money we don't have. NSP doesn't stabilize neighborhoods. It simply spends billions of taxpayer dollars to allow a few homes, scattered here and there, to be purchased, rehabilitated and resold. Again, upon the sale, the money is never returned to the taxpayer. We are facing a \$14.1 trillion national debt. This debt is damaging our economic recovery and is stifling job growth.

We have been warned. Economists say, if we don't address our debt, in a couple of years we could end up bankrupt like Greece. Economists also agree that we must reduce our out-of-

control government spending to create a more favorable environment for private-sector job growth. Unemployed Americans and homeowners need a job and a paycheck, not a handout or another failed, taxpayer-funded program.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to point out that the Neighborhood Stabilization Program that we're talking about here today isn't just dealing with foreclosures. As we all know in this country, there have been pockets where the foreclosure phenomenon and the wave of foreclosures and property abandonment have been concentrated. I have an area like that in my district, in the area of Brockton, Massachusetts, but I can point to other areas all across this country.

What the Neighborhood Stabilization Program allows is for cooperation between communities, banks, lenders, homeowners, and servicers to either preserve homeownership; or in areas across this country such as in Illinois, Nevada, California, and Florida, where thousands and thousands of units have been abandoned in one concentrated area, it allows us to address those abandoned properties where the lender has taken a walk, where the homeowner has taken a walk, where the servicer has taken a walk.

The surrounding communities of homeowners who are trying to stay in their homes are having, first of all, their property values lowered because of the density of abandoned properties in their neighborhoods. This Neighborhood Stabilization Program provides the only opportunity for us to address that crisis. We are trying to put a floor under the housing market in this country—some of us are—and this is one program that allows us to do that.

So I rise in opposition to this bill. I ask that we rethink this idea about eliminating the four voluntary programs that we've got to support housing and to support families who are in a tough spot right now. I would just urge my colleagues to oppose the underlying bill and to try to preserve the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GRIMM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this bill because it doesn't do what it's supposed to do.

This is exactly why I came to Congress.

This bill hurts struggling homeowners. It doesn't help them, because it gives some type of perverse incentive for the banks to foreclose. That's what this program actually does. It pur-

chases these homes from the lenders, from those who are already foreclosed. That is not helping struggling homeowners. I don't deny that the intent was very good, but it is not following through on that intent. It's reckless; it's being misused; and it's wasting millions of taxpayer dollars. It really ends up being nothing more than another bailout. That's the last thing that we need is another bailout.

It's a double hit to the taxpayer. Why? Very simple. Because when the city or municipality purchases this home, that means there are no taxes paid. The argument is, "well, there are no taxes being paid now because it's abandoned," but that's not true. There is something called a "tax lien," and the private sector at some point will buy that tax lien, and that municipality will get its incentive.

□ 1410

So for many, many reasons this bill is failing. It does not follow through on the intent. And we must stop the out-of-control reckless spending. And this is exactly where we need to start, this type of program, \$1 billion of hard-working taxpayer dollars. Let's end the bailouts. Let's stop and remember that the answer to everything is not the government. Often, it is the government that is the problem.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that the gentleman has just explained why this is bad for the cities.

Every organization representing cities and counties and local governments and local economic development agencies disagree with him. They have written to us and asked us to support this program because he is simply wrong about the tax implications.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Mortgage Relief and Neighborhood Stabilization Programs Cost Recoupment Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. COST RECOUPMENT.

Subtitle H of title XIV of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203; 124 Stat. 2205 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1499. FUNDING OFFSET FOR EMERGENCY MORTGAGE RELIEF AND NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION PROGRAMS.

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall, for the purpose of offsetting the costs of assistance under sections 1496 and 1497 of this Act and not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Mortgage Relief and Neighborhood Stabilization Programs Cost Recoupment Act of 2011, make risk-based assessments in the total amount of \$2,500,000,000 on financial companies that manage hedge funds with \$10,000,000,000 or more in assets under management on a consolidated basis and on other financial companies with \$50,000,000,000 or more in total consolidated assets, subject to such terms and conditions as the Treasury Secretary may establish with the concurrence of the Board

of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Any such assessments collected shall be covered into the General Fund of the Treasury.”

PROVISIONS AND POLICIES TO ENSURE THAT
NSP FUNDS USED EFFECTIVELY

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

All purchases of foreclosed properties must be below current market appraised value, taking condition into account.

Rehabilitation of foreclosed properties can only be to extent necessary to comply with housing safety, quality and habitability codes, laws, regulations in order to sell, rent or redevelop.

No profit can be earned on the sale of an abandoned or foreclosed upon home or residential property to an individual as a primary residence—the sale must be in an amount equal to or less than the cost to acquire and redevelop or rehabilitate the home or property up to a decent, safe and habitable condition.

All funds must be used to assist individuals and families with incomes at or below 120% AMI.

At least 25% of funds must be used to purchase/redevelop abandoned or foreclosed residential properties that will be used to house individuals or families with incomes at or below 50% of AMI.

Requires HUD to ensure by rule “to the maximum extent practicable and for the longest feasible term” that properties assisted under program remain affordable to households at/below 120% AMI.

HUD

Current fair market appraisals are required for all NSF-funded acquisition of foreclosed property except where property value is below \$25,000.

Requires grantees to establish minimum rehabilitation requirements and affordable rent policy pursuant to HERA.

Weekly tracking of performance against the requirement that 25% of funds be used to benefit households at or below 50% of AMI.

Requires that program income to be used in accordance with NSP rules. Program income is gross income received by a grantee or a subrecipient directly generated by use of program funds.

Establishment of grantee internal audit requirement as an NSP2 award condition.

Monitors NSP grantees for compliance with program requirements.

Conducts a risk assessment process to identify grantees having potential issues.

Can impose sanctions on the grantee by HUD for programmatic violations.

OIG audits the NSF program and grantees.

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE
NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Given the impact the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) has had throughout the country, over 50 national, state and local organizations have expressed their strong support for continued funding of the program and their strong opposition to H.R. 861.

National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Community Development Association, National Association for County Community and Economic Development, Council of State Community Development Agencies, Enterprise Community Partners, Inc., Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development, Arizona Foreclosure Prevention Task Force, Atlanta Neighborhood Development Partnership, Inc., Center for Community Progress, Center for New York City Neighborhoods, Citizens’ Housing and Planning Association, City of Chicago Depart-

ment of Housing and Economic Development, City of Newark, Columbus Housing Partnership, Council of State Community Development Agencies, Cypress Hills Local Development Corporation, Detroit Office of Foreclosure Prevention and Response, Diamond State Community Land Trust.

Enterprise Community Partners, Habitat for Humanity International, Healthy Neighborhoods, Inc., HousingWorks RI, Greater Rochester Housing Partnership, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Louisiana Housing Alliance, Massachusetts Housing Partnership, Mercy Housing, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, National Community Land Trust Network, National Community Reinvestment Coalition, National Community Stabilization Trust, National Council of State Housing Agencies, National Housing Conference, National Housing Institute, National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, National NeighborWorks Association, Neighborhood Housing Services of Phoenix, Inc., Neighborhood Housing Services of South Florida.

New York Mortgage Coalition, Northfield Community LDC of Staten Island, Inc., Omni New York, LLC, PolicyLink, Rebuilding Together, Restoring Urban Neighborhoods, LLC, RISE, Americal, Smart Growth America, St. Ambrose Housing Aid Center, Stewards for Affordable Housing for the Future, The Community Builders, Inc., The Housing Partnership Network, The Wisconsin Partnership for Housing Development, Inc., Urban Housing Solutions, Inc.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Today we are here again not to discuss any piece of legislation that will create jobs, but to eliminate a program that helps communities across the country—and I state, communities that are helped across the country.

The Neighborhood Stabilizing Program allows local governments to purchase, rehab, and sell foreclosure properties. Without these programs, houses would stay empty—and I say, would stay empty—so we would have to look at our neighborhoods and other areas, causing the value of property to plummet. Local neighborhoods would be forced to use their own funds for maintenance measures and legal fees. Additionally, any empty properties also force communities to adjust and deal with the missing tax revenue—and I say, missing tax revenue—at a time that we need the additional revenue within our communities.

A lot has been made by my colleagues on the other side about one particular group that receives NSP funds, Chicanos por la Causa. What if it was another name? It doesn’t matter. But because it has the name of “Chicanos,” the stereotypes and the images are there. It is about programs that are doing good, not because of the name that is there.

Chicanos por la Causa has unmatched records of providing affordable housing, stabilizing neighborhoods, and serving the needs of low-income communities. They offer a broad range of programs and services and serve over 1,000 clients each year, many of whom live below the Federal poverty, which in a family of four is only \$22,000.

In 2009, the Chicanos led the application for a group of 13 members of the National Association of Latino Community Asset Builders. Together, this group received over \$130 million in NSP funds and put this money to use in projects like in California, where we have a high deficit, Arizona, and 16 other States.

Instead of looking out for Wall Street, instead of looking out for Wall Street and protecting the banks that caused the crisis—and I say, that caused the crisis—NSP awards this funding to invest in Main Street.

This award represents one of the largest single Federal investments ever made that target Latinos and low-income communities, the same communities that have seen a higher rate of foreclosure and unemployment than the national average.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to go to the communities where Chicanos or Hispanics or Latinos and their parents spend their money. Instead of using this tunnel vision—I say, this tunnel vision—solely looking at the numbers, I would ask my friends to look at the actual work that is done in the communities and how those communities have improved and have gotten a lot better.

It is time to stop letting partisan talking points set the agenda for our government. It is time that we start focusing on programs—I say, it is time that we start focusing on programs like NSP and the Chicanos por la Causa that help the Americans get back on their feet.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California, the sponsor of this bill and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Services on International Monetary Policy and Trade, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I enjoyed the comments of my good friend, Mr. BACA, from San Bernardino County. I have some correspondence from San Bernardino County that might interest him.

According to the county offices, there is no one at the county that would support current NSP programs, period. The letters of support did not come from San Bernardino County, which is one of the hardest hit in the Nation. In fact, the county might have supported the current NSP, but this is before they fell victim to complete lack of direction from HUD, mixed messages from HUD, and gross misallocation of awards that were released.

As it applies to my bill, the county says, “We believe it is a means for Congress to get its financial house in order, just like the challenges we are facing at the local level.”

Mr. BACA made a very nice written speech, but his own county that he represents does not support the program. And I was disappointed that a group called Chicanos por la Causa was mentioned. Well, let me just talk about the numbers that I have a problem with.

This NSP allocation program was meant to be a one-time program. It ended up three times. Now, the allocations applied, the problems I had when you look at a county the size of Los Angeles County, they got \$26.3 million; San Bernardino County, Mr. BACA's county, got \$33.2 million; Orange County got \$4.3 million; and San Diego County got \$5.1 million.

Now, all of these counties had to apply Davis-Bacon rules and wage standards to rehab these houses, which meant it cost 25 percent more to do it than the private sector could have done it on a competitive bidding nature.

Now, my good friend Mr. BACA mentioned one group, as if I had something against Chicanos. The problem I have is that nongovernment agencies, such as Neighborhood Lending Partners, got \$50 million—\$50 million; the Community Builders, Inc. got \$78.6 million; Los Angeles Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc. got \$60 million; Neighborhood Lending Partners of West Florida, Incorporated got \$50 million; Chicanos por la Causa got \$137 million.

Understand, L.A. County got \$26.3 million; San Bernardino County got \$33.2 million; Orange County got \$4.3 million; San Diego County got \$4.5 million. The largest population base in California got less money than Chicanos por la Causa. Does that make anybody in America happy?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman not want to mention that Chicanos por la Causa—

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I reclaim my time.

If it had been Germans for Affordable Housing, I would have opposed it. If it had been Italians for Affordable Housing, I would have opposed it. Had it been Irish Germans for Affordable Housing at \$137 million, I would have opposed it.

Understand, these are taxpayer dollars from people who lost their houses, people who are behind in their payments, people who are facing foreclosure, and none of this money does one thing to help you. It was not an equitable application based on who got money and how they got it. In fact, a lot of these private groups write off 17 percent off the top for overhead and costs—17 percent.

Now, we talked about banks. When we lent banks the money in TARP 1, they paid us interest. We paid money because we got our money back. Freddie and Fannie, the money we allocated to them, we are charging them 10 percent interest and they have to pay us back, and the American public is furious at that.

We just gave away \$50 million to one private group, gave \$78 million to another, \$60 million to another, \$50 million to another. And as my good friend JOE BACA says, Chicanos por la Causa,

the poor group, got \$137 million given to you. We are not charging you interest. We gave you the money.

Now, are we helping housing this country? No. Housing starts fell 22 percent in February, the lowest levels since 1959. It has done nothing for housing: 11.8 percent fall in single-family, 47 percent fall in multifamily. Tell me one thing this has done. It has not kept one person in their house.

Now, let's assume this is supposed to be helping poor people buy houses. You just lost your house. In Hawaii, a person making \$73,825 can buy a house through these organizations. A person in California making over \$68,000 can buy a house through these organizations. A group in Virginia, \$74,000; New Jersey, \$78,000; Massachusetts, \$72,000; Utah, \$75,000; Alaska, \$76,000; Colorado, \$73,000; New Hampshire, \$79,000.

So a group, an entity, a State, a county, a city can buy a house. They have to sell it for less than they have in it, and they can sell it to people making more than the person who may have lost the house.

□ 1420

Now, how in the world does that do one thing for poor people? It does not do one thing for poor people.

Now let's talk about jobs. If we had invested \$1 billion in the construction industry to build houses, you would have got \$2.8 billion in economic activities.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. If you would have invested \$1 billion, you would have generated \$2.8 billion in economic activities: \$5.5 million in wages, \$138 million in income for small businesses, \$156 million in corporate profits, \$1.98 billion in spending on goods and services from the above three line items. It is huge. So if we are talking about jobs, let's create jobs.

Now, they say we have had no alternative to what they did. In 2008, I endorsed a bill and introduced it called the Public-Private Partnership Community Stabilization Act. It took government dollars and invested them with private groups to do the same thing, to buy houses that were foreclosed upon and rehab them in communities. And when the houses were sold, guess what? The money would have been paid back to the Federal Government. We would have probably made a profit. We wouldn't have given a dime away. We would have made money on doing the same thing.

Now, the other side talks about abandoned houses. Not a dime of this money can be used for eminent domain, so either the house is for sale or it can't be bought. It can't be foreclosed upon by the government through eminent domain. So to say that some private group could not have bought this house and rehabbed it themselves is ludicrous, because the house has to be for sale.

Now, this group can go out and buy the house, demolish it and end up with a vacant lot. They can go out and buy a house, rehab it and sell it for a dollar, 10, any amount they want to sell it for, to anybody they want to sell it to, as long as it is less than they have in it.

I had a bill passed out of this House that Mr. FRANK cosponsored—he thought it was a good bill—that allowed banks to take foreclosed properties and lease them for 5 years. If you want to get rid of foreclosed properties, allow banks to take the property, rehab it, put it on the marketplace, or lease it out for 5 years. It would have done the same thing, and perhaps banks would not have driven the marketplace down on resales because they were glutted with foreclosures.

We could have taken these houses, leased them, and in 5 years when the market turned around, they could have sold them. And guess what. They could have given a lease option to the person losing the house to stay in the house for 5 years and buy it back at the end of 5 years. It would have at least helped foreclosure projects.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself the 30 seconds the gentleman wouldn't allow me to mention—Chicanos Por la Causa, which he keeps invoking, in what I must say is an inflammatory way, yes, it has \$137 million in eight States. It is a consortium of several groups. Comparing it to one county is quite misleading. It is \$137 million to an organization that has eight States in which it works and which has produced affordable housing units. And as to his argument that it is not for the poor people, almost all of the groups in this country that advocate for housing for low-income groups have sent us a letter urging that this go forward, Habitat for Humanity and others. I take them as more credible on this than my friend.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Thank you, Ranking Member FRANK.

As our Nation's economy moves forward, we must not forget about our neighborhoods, and we must continue to help those areas that are still struggling to come back. That is why I am appalled at the efforts to terminate the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

In my own district of Indianapolis, the neighborhood of Mapleton Fall Creek has been revitalized with NSP funds. What were once eyesores and magnets for crime, they have been renovated, and they are now for resale. These improvements have encouraged low- and middle-income residents to settle into areas known for abandonment and blight. New businesses have opened, and an area once in decline is actually blossoming again. This was all possible because of NSP funding.

We must continue this program for the neighborhoods in Indianapolis and across this great Nation.

I would like to express my support for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)

and to oppose the majority's plans to terminate the program.

All three rounds of NSP are critical because they provide emergency assistance to states, local governments, and nonprofits to acquire and redevelop foreclosed, vacant, and abandoned properties. Many of these properties have become blights on the community and are driving down neighboring property values. The first two rounds of the NSP program impacted an estimated 80,000 foreclosed, abandoned, or vacant properties, and it is estimated that NSP3 will impact tens of thousands more. Terminating the program in the middle of the worst foreclosure crisis since the Great Depression would further harm neighborhoods and many struggling American families. This would most certainly slow the recovery of the housing market.

Specifically in the 7th district of Indiana, the district I represent, I would like to highlight the work of Mapleton Fall Creek Development Corporation which has used NSP funds effectively. On March 14, 2011, Mapleton Fall Creek Development Corporation reported they are halfway through their NSP work. They have completed renovations on 50 units of rental housing and 47 of them are rented. Many of these properties sat empty and boarded up for 5 years and 25 of them were foreclosure properties. They have also acquired 32 houses and 28 lots that will be renovated for new homes. The rebuilt homes will vary from low income apartments to market rate homes for purchase. Lastly, they have demolished 12 vacant and blighted structures, leveraged funds from local banks and other not for profits to increase cash flow and stretch their NSP dollars further, and provided work for four construction managers and numerous contractors.

Mr. Chair, in the 7th district of Indiana, nearly \$3 million of NSP funds were used to obtain and rehab 32 residences as part of the 2012 Super Bowl Housing Legacy Project on Indianapolis' near eastside. NSP 3 funds will also be used to demolish blighted structures in key neighborhoods that have high foreclosure rates, including the old Winona Hospital and Keystone Towers—two enormous blighted structures that have been plagued with crime and environmental concerns for years.

I strongly urge the majority to permit the Neighborhood Stabilization Program to continue. As our nation's economy moves forward we must not forget about our neighborhoods and middle class families. We must help those families and communities that are still struggling to come back.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I seem to have hit a nerve with my good friends on the other side of the aisle when I said Chicanos Por la Causa. It is not who it went to if it is not a government agency, if it was Germans for Affordable Housing. It is \$137 million that I object to going to a group that is a non-government entity that has the money that we will not get back.

And we keep talking about letters of support. Now, if you are a city, a county, or if you are one of these nonprofit groups that received the money, you would be an absolute hypocrite to take

the money and then not send a letter saying, thank you for the money. I think the money was well spent because you gave it to me to spend. Nobody would take money that they didn't want to take.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act. The program has been ill-fated from the start. It has been plagued with problems. We have given almost \$7 billion into a program that has yet to work. HUD was slow in getting the money out the door. Poor reporting has hampered our ability to even measure what has been happening on the program.

Further, the NSP simply acts as a taxpayer bailout for risky lenders, servicers and real estate speculators who bet on the housing market and now can't sell their properties. It has become an even bigger example of those people who believe that the government is the solution to the problems. Government is not the solution to the problem; government is the problem.

We are spending \$3.5 trillion in our annual government spending, and we are bringing in \$2.2 trillion. Next year we are going to have a deficit of \$1.6 trillion; and it is composed of programs exactly like this, programs that do no good, that don't really cause the market to cure itself, and instead taxpayers pay the bill for people who have been speculating and people who just want out.

I had a friend in the office today who talked about his situation with a house in Tucson where he got in at a higher price than it should have been. He was willing to settle for a lesser amount. He was willing to pay. But because the bank could go to the government and make up the difference, they did not have to negotiate with this individual homeowner. Instead, this program causes lenders to say, the taxpayer will make us whole and we are not going to take our losses.

The market will cure the problems we face if we allow the markets to work, but this government program does not allow the market to work. This Nation is dying for jobs, and it is government spending, government regulation and government taxation that are causing the jobs to be killed and to be sent out of this country.

If we will get our focus correct on lowering taxes, lowering the regulatory environment, especially to lenders who would be out lending now except they are afraid to because of the regulatory environment, we would begin to create jobs for the first time in a long time.

With 9 percent unemployment, it is time for us to cure the problems of the economy, to quit spending on wasteful programs, and to give this country a leg up on prosperity. That is the thing we are missing right now.

The hope of prosperity for the middle class is gone, and it is because of programs like this soaking the taxpayer and giving money to people who probably could do something different. It is not fixing up any neighborhood. I don't see the reports in any magazine or newspaper telling us of the flock of people moving to these rehabilitated neighborhoods.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I rise to express support for H.R. 861.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself 15 seconds.

The gentleman from California says he is not singling out Chicanos Por la Causa, that there are other private organizations, but he never mentions them. And he says, well, they are not a government entity. That is right. We don't think it all has to go through the government. We think places like Habitat for Humanity and others have a role to play.

I yield 3 minutes to the former mayor of the city of Somerville, Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the most legitimate argument I have heard is we have a deficit and we have to deal with it. That is a fair and reasonable point to make. However, it is not a fair and reasonable approach towards the problem to begin with programs like this. We can't even talk about what we are spending on the Iraq war. We can't talk about any money in the Defense Department or anywhere else. The first programs we start with are these types of programs.

Let me be clear about what this program is. I am a former mayor in a strong mayor form of government.

□ 1430

We get a fair amount of Federal and State money, and we use some of our own money on occasion to buy and rehabilitate property. Sometimes it meant knocking it down, sometimes it meant making a recreational area, sometimes it meant building a school, whatever it might be, to improve a neighborhood. And to say this money is not improving neighborhoods is just to be blind. There are stories all over the country where improvements are being made.

I'm not going to argue that every single penny of this program or any other program has been perfectly well spent. That would be crazy. I have no problem at all looking at this program or any program to come up with things we don't like; to change the rules as to who might be eligible tomorrow. And on and on and on. Those are fine and fair things to say. I'm not going to defend one group or any formula. Those are legitimate things to argue about. But to say that the program doesn't work and this is where we should start addressing our deficit, I think, is to be shortsighted.

It also says to me, if you don't like the program, that's fine. Then I would strongly suggest that anybody who

doesn't like the program pick up the phone to their mayor, to their county administrator, to their Governor, and say, Send the money back. Every State in the country has gotten money. California has gotten over \$886 million. If you don't want it, send it back. Massachusetts only got \$106 million. Now, we think it's doing pretty well, so we're going to keep it. But if you don't want it, send it back. Nevada, a much smaller State than Massachusetts, got almost as much money because they got hit harder than we did in this economy.

To argue that a few problems that you have—and I'm not even going to suggest that I agree or don't agree. The points are well made. If you don't want one entity, any entity to get \$137 million, fine. Let's talk about it. Let's say they don't do it. That's not a problem. If you want to say that we have to change about how this money is being used, fine. Let's limit it. No problem.

But to pretend that a neighborhood, any neighborhood, is well served by ignoring boarded-up properties, by saying, Walk away from your home, walk away from your business, and the neighborhood will recover without you, is shortsighted and wrong. And to pretend that somehow because we're giving this money away, that that is an inherent evil in and of itself, ignores all the grants that this government gives away, that other governments give away, not just in housing, but in research, in any number of fields. Again, if you want to cut out all grants, fine. That is a reasonable and consistent argument. But you also then have to cut out tax credits, because we give out billions of dollars in Federal tax credit dollars that do the same thing in housing.

All I'm saying is if you want to fix the program, fix it. If you want to turn your back on neighborhoods, go ahead and do that. But not with my help.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my good friend admitting that we're giving the money away, because we are. I struck a nerve for some reason when everybody keeps bringing up Chicanos Por La Causa for \$137 million. The reason I think it's egregious is we gave \$1.3 billion away to nongovernment entities. And this one entity got 10 percent of all the nongovernment funding that went out. Nobody has mentioned that I mentioned other groups that got \$50 million, \$70 million, \$60 million, \$50 million each. I mentioned those groups. But what did HUD say about the money? When I quizzed Mercedes Marquez of HUD, her quote was "The money is going to homeowners and to American citizens."

The problem I have with this, how do you feel about the people who lost the home? You've got a family, they put money into the home. The last couple of years have been tough. They couldn't repair the plumbing, they

couldn't replace the appliances, they couldn't afford to replace the broken window, they couldn't paint the house because their house was in foreclosure. They lost that house. Now, we're spending \$7 billion, and we have not helped one person in this country remain a homeowner.

If your house is going into foreclosure, you're going to lose it. And these dollars are going to be spent to rehab your house and sell it to somebody else.

Wake up, America.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, it's amazing to me that we're here at this time when we've seen 4 million foreclosures across America, perhaps 7 million. We've seen neighborhoods devastated. And instead of the majority conference offering solutions to this foreclosure crisis, instead of them coming forth and saying, You know what, here's what we think we need to do for the American people to stay in their homes, all they want to do is destroy what Democrats have done. It's amazing. It's really something that I hope the American people pay very close attention to.

The gentleman on the other end says that, Look, somebody's going to buy the house that you lost in foreclosure. If we can be successful with programs like the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, we will create an environment where people will not lose their homes because the value of their homes will not plummet. They will not end up underwater. And people will have somewhere that they can live and a neighborhood that they can be proud of.

But because the Republican conference is making itself abundantly clear, I think it needs to be clear to the American people whose side we're on. The Democrats are on the side of the American people staying in their homes. The Republican conference is on the side of throwing people out and foreclosing on Americans. And it's a sad, sad day in our Congress. We are in the middle of an enormous debate on the proper role of government. We believe the proper role of government is to have fair rules, to have real enforcement of our financial regulations, to have real consumer protection, and to intervene when people's neighborhoods are being destroyed by foreclosure.

The Republicans say, You're on your own. The market has all the answers. The market answers every question. Well, it doesn't answer every question, especially when the market doesn't have any cops on the beat, and when you let the people engage in all sorts of nefarious practices that caused the economic conditions that we're in today.

The Republican conference was in power when the regulations that led to this destruction were in place—and they did nothing. When the Democrats

got in charge, we solved it. And now they're trying to disassemble it.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address two things that the minority has raised. One is they've talked about fairness. And I will tell you that there's nothing fair about this program. In fact, it's an unfair program. It's unfair for most Americans. The second thing they've talked about is foreclosures. This program causes foreclosures. This program encourages foreclosures. This program promotes foreclosures.

Now let's talk about the foreclosures first and then we'll talk about fair. What does this program do? Does it prevent foreclosures? No. It encourages foreclosures. It allows nonprofits, community organizations, and cities and counties to buy foreclosed properties. In other words, to create a market for foreclosed properties. The minority supplied us with pictures of two of these properties. This is the one in Baltimore, Maryland. This was one of two. I think the other one was in Los Angeles, as I recall. This is the property.

Now, just like all these properties, it's not owned by a homeowner. There's no homeowner there. It's owned by a bank or a real estate speculator. It might have been somebody that put someone in this house with what we call an exploding loan. Put someone in that house that couldn't afford it.

So, what do we do? We construct a program that says to this bank that owns this property, that's paying taxes to the government on this property—we don't say to tear this down, or we don't say we're going to condemn it and convert it, and we're going to get it with no charge. No. We buy it. Now, is that right?

You said the banks caused this, the lenders. We ought to penalize those that are at fault. Well, how does penalizing a lender who made a loan on this property, how is writing them a check fair? No, it's not. This is a bailout for lenders and speculators. Now, is it fair? Well, is it fair to our grandchildren and our children, \$4 billion every day that goes out of our Treasury, more than we bring in. Four billion dollars a day. In fact, the deficit for February was 230-something billion dollars.

Now, every day they talk about fairness, and I have quoted this with every one of these failed programs. I have quoted Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who says our debt is the biggest threat to our national security, the existence of our country. Well, let's just talk about one thing we do every day. We owe China 9½ percent of our debt; 9 to 9½ percent is owed to China. Every day we write a check to China because we won't face up to this exploding spending of \$120 million a day.

□ 1440

They could buy a Joint Strike Force Fighter every day and still put \$20 million in their pocket. Every day. They could build an Air Force bigger than our Air Force in 5 years on money they earn from us and that our taxpayers pay because we won't confront programs like this. Because "fair" to us is saying yes to everyone except the taxpayers.

And, oh, there are 4 million foreclosures in this country this year. That's a terrible figure. But I tell you, this program will do nothing but increase that number. And to think that it's fair to our children and grandchildren to devise a program but not have the money to pay it and stick it on our children and grandchildren, it ought to infuriate any of us who are grandparents. It does me.

It's time now to end this foolishness which threatens the very existence of our country.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself 2 minutes to say I am struck by the incongruity of Members who have voted for the war in Iraq, a trillion-dollar huge mistake, ongoing, who vote to continue what seems to me a futile effort now in Afghanistan.

The gentleman from Alabama, and we've talked about this before, he said that because the Obama administration told him he had to, he voted to send \$150 million a year last year, next year, for the next 2 years to the cotton farmers of Brazil. The gentleman opposed a \$250,000 limit on subsidies to any individual farmer. In the budget, the gentleman voted, as did most on his side, to send \$1.2 billion to beef up Iraqi security forces. What about American security forces? What about giving some money to the cities so when they have to deal with abandoned property, they don't have to take that out of the hides of their police departments and fire departments?

Yes, we should reduce the deficit. But to be for the enormous waste in the Pentagon—and, by the way, Members cite Mike Mullen. I wish, in addition to citing the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they would make a simple commitment not to vote for the Pentagon money he doesn't want. Because Members on that side cite his warning about the defense budget, about the deficit, and then force money on him that he thinks is useless.

So let's talk about the disparity between people who vote enormous amounts of money; \$400 million goes to Afghan infrastructure, we're told. Well, let's have it be done efficiently. I cannot think that in any program in America we are going to be spending the money less efficiently than the \$400 million my friends over there have voted to send to Afghanistan.

So let's look at this in a reasonable way. And we also believe that this billion dollars, in fact, helps our cities. And there's one fundamental error they make: the assumption is that for every piece of property—by the way, it

is not simply foreclosed property; it is abandoned property—for every piece of property that's out there, there is a responsible financial institution whom you can sue and get the money from. That simply isn't true.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself 30 more seconds.

For many of these pieces of property, the cities are left with no recourse. There is no one to do it. One of the Members said the other day in committee, Well, they can send out their bulldozer. Yeah, they can pull a firefighter off and hire a bulldozer operator.

The fact is that it is not simply for foreclosed property. It's for foreclosed and abandoned property, and the notion that there are no buildings out there in the cities where there is no responsible financial entity is nonsense. And so what we're telling the cities is, It's tough. You've had these foreclosure problems. You've had this abandonment problem. You could sell it to the private sector, and the private sector will buy some, but they won't buy it all.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman and Members, I think that my colleague from Minnesota said it all: Whose side are you on? Are you on the side of the American taxpayers who trusted us to regulate this industry that had responsibility for these mortgages? Are you on the side of taxpayers who simply wanted to live the American Dream, who simply wanted to get into a mortgage so that they could own a home and do what it is the American Dream says we can do and we can accomplish?

They trusted us to make sure that our regulators did their job. We all let them down. We allowed these mortgage firms, these loan initiators, these big banks to create these exotic products, products we had never heard of before.

Nobody questioned what was a no doc loan. Nobody asked what is this teaser loan. Nobody talked about what happens when these loans reset. And the American taxpayer was confronted with a mortgage with 30, 40 pieces of paper and they signed on the dotted line, because they wanted to live the American Dream. Little did they know that they would not be able to meet the reset amount, 6 months, 1 year, 2 years from now; and so they got caught up in the scheme. It was a huge, fraudulent scheme perpetrated on the American people by major financial institutions.

Americans didn't decide all of a sudden that they didn't want to pay their bills, that they didn't want to pay their mortgage. Something big happened. And what happened was this big fraud that was perpetrated on the American people came to reality and the devil came due, and now it was time to pay, and they couldn't afford it.

Added to that, the recession that was caused by the subprime meltdown

caused people to be in situations where they lost their jobs, or they were now in jobs that paid less than the jobs that they had when the economy was good. And so now we have people who have lost all these homes. They're foreclosed on, they're boarded up, they're abandoned. And, guess what, they're bringing down the neighborhoods. Those people who stay in the neighborhoods and keep up their homes, they're losing value because of these boarded-up properties and because of these abandoned properties.

So the government said, and I said and BARNEY FRANK said, those of us who created this program said, we have a responsibility to help the American people, because, through no fault of their own, now their homes are underwater, their homes have lost value, and so we have the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program does give money to counties and cities and nonprofits and all to go in and rehab these properties, put them back on the market, upgrade the neighborhood, reduce the cost to fire and police and all of those city agencies that now have got to look after these boarded-up properties, where the animals are coming in and the weeds are growing up and neighbors are saying, My government, please help me.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. WATERS. That's what the Neighborhood Stabilization Program is all about. And it creates jobs. It creates jobs, because now we've got the contractors, the subcontractors, the painters, the Realtors all involved in helping to rehab this neighborhood, helping to stabilize these communities, creating jobs, assisting the American taxpayers who got into these situations through no fault of their own.

Whose side are you on? Are you on the side of those who rip off our taxpayers? Or are you on the side of the taxpayers who sent you here to look after them and to be responsible?

Mrs. BIGGERT. May I inquire of the Chair how much time each side has remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BIGGERT. At this time I would yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BACHUS. Well, there you go again. Instead of talking about this program, you want to talk about the Brazil cotton deal, or you want to talk about Afghanistan. And I'll talk about those.

But before I do, I have a question for you, for my colleagues on the Democratic side who talk about investing in this property. I want you to get a good look at this.

Are you willing to put your money up to buy that?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No, I don't think any private entity would—I'm sorry. May I answer the question?

That's why we want to give money to the cities so they can tear it down, because otherwise they'll be stuck with it. I don't think any private investor would put money in that. There's no other way to deal with it, and the way to deal with it is to give them the money so they can tear it down.

□ 1450

Mr. BACHUS. Let's tear it down. I agree with you. And let's make the person who owns it tear it down. And this idea that this person can't be found, that this person—

I would ask for order.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members to address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. BACHUS. And I would say to the Chair—and I appreciate that—that if any of my colleagues want to buy this property and think it's a good investment, they can hire painters and Realtors and put all these people to work, but the taxpayers, they're having trouble paying their own mortgages. They're having trouble financing their own children's education. And whose side are we on?

Listen, this program has benefited less than 2,000 pieces of property—banks—but we've got 12 million American families who are underwater on their mortgage. And do you think it's even fair to pay off, as y'all proposed, a half a million of those mortgages? How about the other 21 out of 22? You know, you can't pay off all 12 million. You will break the country. So you say, well, we're going to do the best we can. You're going to pick winners and losers.

Let me tell you something. The taxpayers that are paying their mortgages or own their own homes or didn't get into this problem—don't you get the message from November? The American people don't want us paying—they don't want to pay for someone else's obligations.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BACHUS. Now, let's talk about this Brazilian cotton, and let me tell you, if I were you—I'd say to the Chair, if I were the ranking member, I would talk about anything but buying this property and fixing it up. I'd do anything to avoid that conversation. I'd avoid anything to talk about that we're paying the banks with taxpayer money.

But you mentioned Brazil and you said it was a stupid deal. You said it took a Flip Wilson to do this. Well, it was Ron Kirk, trade ambassador, that entered into the agreement. And who

hired him? President Obama. So you ought to take it up with the Democratic administration who saddled us with this \$150 million obligation.

I close with Afghanistan. I have a son who's in the U.S. Marines. He was in there for 10 years and he's out now, but let me tell you something. I will spend money to build up an Afghan force so we can bring our young men and women home.

[From the Office of the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President]

U.S., BRAZIL AGREE ON FRAMEWORK
REGARDING WTO COTTON DISPUTE

WASHINGTON, DC.—Today Brazil's Ministers reached a decision in support of a Framework regarding the Cotton dispute, which would avert the imposition of countermeasures of more than \$800 million this year. This includes more than \$560 million in countermeasures against U.S. exports which were scheduled to go into effect on Monday, June 21, 2010, as well as possible countermeasures on intellectual property rights that could have taken effect later. We are pleased with this decision, and look forward to signing the Framework soon.

The findings in the Cotton dispute concern U.S. cotton support under the marketing loan and countercyclical payment programs, and the GSM-102 Export Credit Guarantee Program. In line with these findings, the Framework has two major elements.

First, it would provide, as a basis for a discussion toward reaching a mutually agreed solution to the dispute, a limit on trade-distorting cotton subsidies. Second, the Framework would provide benchmarks for changes to certain elements of the current GSM-102 program. In the Framework, the United States and Brazil would agree to meet quarterly to discuss the successor legislation to the 2008 Farm Bill as it relates to trade-distorting cotton subsidies and the operation of GSM-102. The Framework would not serve as a permanent solution to the Cotton dispute. However, it would provide specific interim steps and a process for continued discussions on the programs at issue with a view to reaching a solution to the dispute.

"I am pleased that we have been able to negotiate a Framework regarding the WTO Cotton dispute that would avoid the imposition of countermeasures against U.S. trade, including goods and intellectual property," said Ambassador Kirk. "While respecting the role of the United States Congress in developing the next Farm Bill, this Framework would now allow us to continue to work toward a final resolution of the Cotton dispute. I believe this Framework will go a long way in alleviating the uncertainty in our business communities and enhance the ability of the United States and Brazil to build upon our dynamic trading relationship."

"This framework agreement provides a way forward as we work with Congress toward a new farm bill in 2012," said Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack. "Although it is not a permanent solution, I am pleased that it allows us to maintain our programs while considering adjustments and avoiding the immediate imposition of countermeasures against U.S. exports as a result of the WTO cotton decision."

Background

The Cotton dispute is a long-running dispute brought by Brazil against the United States. In 2005 and again in 2008, the World Trade Organization (WTO) found that certain U.S. agricultural support payments and guarantees are inconsistent with WTO commitments: (1) payments to cotton producers

under the marketing loan and countercyclical programs; and (2) export credit guarantees under the GSM-102 program, a USDA program used to provide guarantees for credit extended by U.S. banks or exporters to approved foreign banks for purchases of U.S. agricultural exports.

On August 31, 2009, WTO arbitrators issued arbitration awards in this dispute. These awards provided the level of countermeasures that Brazil could impose against U.S. trade. The annual amount of countermeasures has two parts: 1) a fixed amount of \$147.3 million for the cotton payments and 2) an amount for the GSM-102 program that varies based upon program usage. Using the data that we have given Brazil (in accordance with the arbitrators' award), the current total of authorized countermeasures is more than \$800 million.

The arbitrators also provided that Brazil could impose cross-sectoral countermeasures (i.e. countermeasures in sectors outside of trade in goods, specifically intellectual property and services). It may impose cross-sectoral countermeasures to the extent that it applies total countermeasures in excess of a threshold. The threshold varies annually, but is currently approximately \$560 million. Therefore, of the approximately \$820 million in countermeasures Brazil could impose now, about \$260 million of that could be cross-sectoral.

On March 8, 2010 Brazil announced a final list of products that would face higher tariffs beginning on April 7, 2010. Goods on the list include autos, pharmaceuticals, medical equipment, electronics, textiles, wheat, fruit and nuts, and cotton. Brazil had not made a final decision on which U.S. intellectual property rights might be affected by cross-sectoral countermeasures, but it had begun the process to make this determination.

On April 1, Deputy USTR Miriam Sapiro and USDA Undersecretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services Jim Miller met with Ambassador Antonio Patriota, Secretary General of Brazil's Ministry of External Relations to discuss possible resolution of the dispute. As a result of that dialogue, the Government of Brazil agreed not to impose any countermeasures on U.S. trade at that time. In exchange, the United States agreed to work with Brazil to establish a fund of approximately \$147.3 million per year on a pro rata basis to provide technical assistance and capacity building to the cotton sector in Brazil, and for international co-operation related to the same sector in certain other countries. Under the Memorandum of Understanding that the United States and Brazil signed on April 20, 2010, the fund would continue until passage of the next Farm Bill or a mutually agreed solution to the Cotton dispute is reached, whichever is sooner. The fund is subject to transparency and auditing requirements.

The United States also agreed to make certain near term modifications to the operation of the GSM-102 Export Credit Guarantee Program, and to engage with the Government of Brazil in technical discussions regarding further operation of the program. In addition, the United States published a proposed rule on April 16, 2010, to recognize the State of Santa Catarina as free of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, classical swine fever, African swine fever, and swine vesicular disease, based on World Organization for Animal Health Guidelines, and to complete a risk evaluation and identify appropriate risk mitigation measures to determine whether fresh beef can be imported from Brazil while preventing the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States.

The parties further agreed on April 1 that they would work to develop a Framework regarding the Cotton dispute by June 21, which

would provide a path forward for a negotiated solution to the Cotton dispute and allow both countries to avoid the impact of countermeasures. Negotiators from Brazil and the United States have been engaged intensively over the past several months, and successfully concluded this Framework.

Brazil is the United States' 10th largest trading partner with a total two-way goods trade of approximately \$60 billion in 2009.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself 3 minutes.

First of all, the gentleman says why are you talking about other programs, why don't you just talk about this program, but he talks about hundreds of billions of dollars of deficit, and this is a billion dollar program. So he hardly, Mr. Chairman, follows his own rules. He talks about hundreds of billions of dollars about a billion dollar program. I am joining him in saying, yes, we have a large deficit, of which this program is an infinitesimal part.

Secondly, I am puzzled that my Republican friends, who generally tell us that the President is not very good at his job, hide behind him when it's politically convenient. Yes, this is an Obama deal. The President was wrong. And unlike the gentleman from Alabama, if I think the President has made a foolish decision, I'm going to vote against it, not to send the money to Brazil. It wasn't the President who told you to vote not to limit the subsidies to \$250,000 per person.

And as to bringing people home from Afghanistan, we will have a chance tomorrow to bring people home from Afghanistan. I will vote for that. Sending \$400 million for corrupt infrastructure expenditures isn't bringing anybody home. So let's bring them home. The gentleman will have a chance to do that tomorrow.

But then I want to go back to his thing about do you want to invest? No. He just ignored the facts. This is not just about foreclosed properties. It's about abandoned properties. He says do I want to invest? He said do I want to buy it? Does he know who owns that? Could he give me the address? And what the gentleman said, he said of course you can find out who owns it; it's not hard.

We believe that there are properties where you can't find the owner. Now, the gentleman got the picture. He must know about the property.

Would you give us the address and the name of the responsible owner so we can tell the city not to use public money?

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Well, let me ask you this—

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No. I will yield for the purpose of asking the gentleman a question.

He said it's possible to find the address and the owner. I am asking him to live up to what he said. Can he tell us who the owner is? He's got the picture of the property. He says, no, you don't have to spend public money to tear it down. Go after the responsible owner.

I ask the gentleman, can he tell us who is the responsible owner?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BACHUS. It was the person that you wrote the check to. You have to buy it, and you wrote the check out. So you know who the owner is.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman is wrong.

I reclaim my time.

Mr. BACHUS. You wrote the check to somebody.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Please instruct the gentleman as to the rules. He is blatantly wrong. It is not simply purchasing property. This gives the city money, and maybe that's why they are so wrong on this. They don't understand the program. It includes giving the city money to go in—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself another minute, because these people take a lot of work to get them to explain it.

The fact is that it isn't simply to buy it from a responsible owner. It includes money, as we have tried to explain to them, to demolish property. In fact, in the cities of Detroit and Cleveland, they specifically asked us—the gentleman from Los Angeles amended it—you can use city money to demolish property when there is no owner. So, no, there is no—you don't write a check to someone who has abandoned the property.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BACHUS. Well, let me ask you this: The IG said they couldn't trace some of this money, and I think we've all figured that out. If we don't know whom we're paying—

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I reclaim my time to point out the evasion.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself another 30 seconds.

The gentleman made a big point of saying, buy the property from this person. He doesn't know who owns the property. No one knows who owns the property because no one owns the property. They walked away from it.

And what we're saying is part of this is not to pay off the bank. And I will say, last point, and as you know, the taxpayers shouldn't do it. In the bill that passed the conference committee which authorized this billion dollars, we said that the money should come not from the taxpayers but from large financial institutions that have more than \$50 billion in assets and hedge funds with more than \$10 billion. Republican opposition killed it. I'm going to refile that bill today.

So I invite my Republican colleagues to join me and we will sponsor this bill, and it's in the committee that the gentleman chairs. Let's pass a bill that says the money that will go to cities to knock down property where they can't find the owner will get it from the large banks and from the large hedge

funds. And if the gentleman will agree with that, then this whole argument about the deficit will disappear.

But I will predict, Mr. Chairman, that they will find that that's not so persuasive, and they will put up with the deficit when it means saving money for the large banks.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Well, my good friend Mr. FRANK knows you can go to any land title company and they'll tell you who owns the property: either the person lost it to a bank that had a loan on it or the bank owns it now; and if they didn't have a loan on it, they still own the property. And if the property's been abandoned, under rules of public safety, the city can go and demolish a property for public safety measures.

But the difference is—I'm glad that Mr. FRANK said he disagrees with the Obama administration because I think they're wrong, too, but in this case I think you're wrong.

This proposal does not make any sense. We believe we're on the side of the people who are paying taxes in this country. Many are going through foreclosure. Many are out of work. We've taken your tax dollars and we've decided to give it to somebody else to buy property from the very banks that they take and say are so awful.

Now, there's been a lot of predatory loans made in this country. Lenders should not have made loans to people. They took advantage of people, no doubt. But then they foreclosed on those very people and we give private groups and government entities the ability to go buy the property from those banks, take and refurbish it, and sell it to people.

□ 1500

Now I will state again, in California, you can earn over \$68,000 and buy one of these homes. You can earn between \$73,000 and \$80,000 and live in Hawaii, Virginia, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Utah, Alaska, Colorado, New Hampshire, and qualify to pick up a very good deal. Sometimes it might be based on who you know that has the house currently. Are you affiliated with somebody at the city at a good level or the county? Or do you know one of these people at the nongovernment agencies on the board of directors, and you say, Hey, my cousin would like to buy one of these houses. And by the way, he'd like a good deal. There is nothing in the bill that precludes that. The bill says clearly that you have to sell it for less than you paid and reinvested in it. It does not say how much less you have to sell it for or how much you sell it for.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

First of all, this program has been going on for some time. If there were any of the horror stories to match those hypotheticals, we would have

heard from them. But I will say this to the gentleman from California. He admits under public safety, the city might have to go in and tear it down with no recompense. Here is my proposal, and I invite my Republican colleagues again to do this. Come back with us to when we had a bill that said, This program will be paid for not by the taxpayers but by an assessment on financial institutions with more than \$50 billion in assets and hedge funds with more than \$10 billion in assets. I will introduce this bill tomorrow. They can give us a hearing on it, mark it up, and it won't cost the taxpayers a cent. And it will save the cities money.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

As the ranking member stated before, this is not only about foreclosed properties, this is about abandoned properties. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program will help rehabilitate over 600 properties in New York City alone, but this is not just an issue for New York. This is a national problem. It was created by a decade of overheated mortgage lending and excess on Wall Street. It makes sense that our cities should have a national response. But contrary to common sense, the bill we consider today would abandon our cities and towns and force them to deal with this issue on their own.

The foreclosure crisis has a ripple effect on our whole economy. Foreclosed and abandoned homes consume limited city resources. At the same time, these homes lower property values for everyone in the neighborhood. Assistance from the NSP can not only rehabilitate empty homes, it can also reverse the downward spiral in property values. This bill eliminates the only housing mitigation program committed to stemming these ripple effects. Foreclosures are costly to everyone. Without the NSP, Main Street will bear the costs of the problem created on Wall Street.

Nationwide, nearly 100,000 projects will be undertaken with NSP funds. Property values will be restored in these neighborhoods, and working families will once again have access to affordable housing. Yet if this legislation is enacted, 200 projects in New York City will go unfinished. Withdrawing support for the NSP at this stage will slow the budding recovery in our housing sector not just for New York City but also for cities and towns across America. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this ill-conceived and, I have to say, mean-spirited legislation.

Mrs. BIGGERT. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Chairman from day one, the majority of this Congress promised the

American people that we would focus like a laser on producing results. And over the past 2 months, we have already begun to deliver on that promise by upending the culture of spending that prevailed in Washington and replace it with a culture of savings. The most important thing government can do right now is to create an environment that fosters opportunity for people. But if you talk to the small businesses and entrepreneurs who create jobs, they will tell you that the explosion of government debt is threatening their ability to innovate and compete. Unless we move swiftly to change course, our economy will be consumed by fears of future tax increases, inflation, and higher borrowing costs. That's why our majority is dedicated to our cut-and-grow agenda, cutting spending and job-destroying regulations and growing private sector jobs in the economy.

Yesterday we took another significant step toward returning spending to 2008 levels. Today we offer Members a chance through the YouCut program to cut an additional \$1 billion in waste. This legislation, endorsed by millions of voters in the YouCut program, would terminate the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, a pot of money, as the other side will tell you, that enables State and local governments to buy and rehabilitate foreclosed homes. Instead of benefiting at-risk homeowners facing foreclosure, however, this program may instead create perverse incentives for banks and other lenders to foreclose on troubled borrowers. The people's House is drawing a firm line in the sand against wasteful spending and inefficient government programs, and I urge my colleague the to support this legislation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. How much time remains on both sides, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Illinois has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. My good friend Mr. FRANK brought up a good point. He said, Well, show me where any of these egregious things and illegal things have occurred where somebody has cut somebody a deal. Well, I can't show you any because there are no requirements. You could take one of these nonprofit, nongovernment entities out here that bought a house. They have \$180,000 in the house. One of the board members' cousins could buy that house for \$100,000, and it does not violate the requirements within the bill because it says you have to sell that house for less than the acquisition and rehabilitation prices. It does not say how much less. It says that you must not exceed an amount.

So my good friend is absolutely correct. I cannot show you an egregious

act because there is no egregious act defined within the legislation. And that's the problem with the bill. I believe we are trying to say that the Republicans are on the side of the taxpayers. We believe that we need to do everything we can in this country to create jobs. And if we leave \$7 billion in the economy based on the basic money multiplier of 10 percent, it creates \$70 billion worth of economy and generation. We believe in that. We do believe in fair rules. And we believe that if a person has to watch their home go into foreclosure, and they live in California, and they watch a county, a city, or a nonprofit group buy that home, that they can sell that home to someone for \$68,000 and all that person can do that lost their home is wipe the tears away.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the gentleman's acknowledgement. With all of their efforts, they are out finding pictures of abandoned houses, they couldn't find one example of where that abuse took place. In fact, there are a set of rules and restrictions that HUD has that I will submit under general leave. But again, let's review some of their errors. The fundamental error is the argument that this is a program which buys money from banks that have foreclosed and own the property. In fact, it is foreclosed and abandoned property. There are also entities that foreclose that weren't banks, that are not in existence anymore. Yes, it does not deal with all the properties. Where there is a responsible bank that you can go after, the cities go after them. But the suggestion that in Detroit, in Cleveland, in Boston, in Chicago, in all of our cities and in our rural areas there are no abandoned properties that lack someone you can sue is unreality. This is a triumph of ideological reflex over empirical observation. What this says to cities is, where you cannot find a responsible owner to go after, and the property is festering, if it's too far gone, you can tear it down. If it's not too far gone, you can take it and resell it for an affordable unit. Yes, it's got to be a limited income situation.

□ 1510

So that just disputes the whole notion that there's always somebody else you can get. But I still believe it's true that we shouldn't let this come from the taxpayer.

But I want to reiterate, and I'll make this offer. In the conference committee on Financial Reform, when this bill was passed—that's true also, by the way, of the emergency homeowners' relief—we said, let's not have it come from the taxpayer. Let's have it come from financial institutions with \$50 billion or more in assets, except for hedge funds, where it's \$10 billion or more in assets.

If that had passed, it would have cost the taxpayers, the general revenue nothing. It would not have added to the deficit. And to the extent that some financial institutions were benefiting,

they would have had to contribute. In fact, it would have had the larger financial institutions help the smaller financial institutions.

The Republicans killed that before, but I believe in repentance, Mr. Chairman. I believe in second chances for miscreants. I'm going to give, Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues a second chance. So for all their rhetoric about the deficit, here's the response. Here are the choices:

You can tell Detroit and Cleveland and other cities, you tear down that property when there's nobody else to go to and you pay for it and lay off some teachers and cops and firefighters, or you leave the property up there to fester. Or you do it our way. You join in assessing the large financial institutions. And I don't mean to demonize Citicorp or Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, Blackstone. These are decent people. They are trying to make a profit. I don't always agree with them. Why don't we let them pay the billion dollars?

So if there is a genuine concern about the deficit—I'm skeptical when people want to send the money to Afghanistan and Iraq and to Brazilian cotton farmers. Obama made them do that. Whenever they have a tough political decision, Mr. Chairman, Obama did it. Why can't they solve the problems of Fannie and Freddie? Well, Obama won't tell them how to do it. So they always hide behind the President when it's convenient.

But here's the deal. It is undeniable. Let's go back to the gentleman from Alabama. He found a building that was so decrepit he had a picture, and he said to us, You can go to the owner of that building and get the money. Well, he could find the building to take a picture, but he couldn't find the owner. Because I asked him, If that's the case, if we can go to the owner, tell me who the owner is and let's try and go after him. And he left the floor because he doesn't know who the owner is because in some cases nobody knows who the owner is because the property has been abandoned or it was foreclosed upon by an entity that's no longer in existence.

So join with us, make the large financial institutions and the hedge funds pay for this, and save the cities money that they do not have.

MARCH 3, 2011.

OPPOSE BILLS THAT SHUT OUT HOMEOWNERS AND ABANDON COMMUNITIES

House Financial Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The following civil rights and consumer organizations are writing to urge you to vote AGAINST the four bills coming before the House Financial Services Committee tomorrow that would eliminate the primary foreclosure prevention lifelines available to homeowners and communities struggling to make it out of our economic recession. For the reasons stated below, now is precisely the wrong time to end these programs.

It is in the nation's interest to prevent foreclosures. Everyone benefits when we can help families stay in their homes. Preventable foreclosures cripple the overall economy

by adding vacant houses to the already flooded housing market, further depressing housing prices and adding harmful uncertainty to this critical market sector. An estimated 11.57 million borrowers—1 in 5—are currently in danger of losing their homes. And unemployment and foreclosure now go hand-in-hand. Despite the average length of unemployment now at eight months, so many families who have lost their jobs or seen a drop in income as a result of the recession are now also losing their homes. We need to do more, not less, to help these families and stabilize the economy.

It is in the nation's interest to bring communities back. When families fail, communities fail. Families who have suffered foreclosure will feel the impact of foreclosure for years to come. Among many destabilizing consequences, they must confront their lives' disruption, the loss of their credit standing, and the higher cost and limited availability of future credit. But the impact of the foreclosure crisis is being felt far beyond the immediate home and neighborhood. This crisis has devastated entire communities, which suffer from a loss of community members, the disruption of community institutions, a decline in property values, and an increase in vacant and abandoned properties. Virtually every community across the country is feeling the fallout in the form of falling tax revenues and growing budget crises. Now is not the time to cut the programs created to prevent the foreclosures that fuel these broader problems.

Foreclosures continue to proceed at record levels, with disproportionately heavy impacts on communities and families of color, who are facing foreclosure at twice the rate of other families because of discrimination. Foreclosure prevention is a civil rights issue, and communities of color are suffering a disproportionate loss of wealth. Several studies have documented pervasive racial discrimination in the distribution of subprime loans. One such study found that borrowers of color are more than 30 percent more likely to receive a higher-rate loan than white borrowers even after accounting for differences in creditworthiness.¹ Another study found that high-income African Americans in predominantly Black neighborhoods were three times more likely to receive a subprime purchase loan than low-income white borrowers.² An analysis of loan, credit, and census data has shown that even after controlling for percent minority, low credit scores, poverty, and median home value, "racial segregation is clearly linked with the proportion of subprime loans originated at the metropolitan level."³ This research supports the conclusion that racial segregation is itself an important determinant of subprime lending. The resulting flood of high cost loans in communities of color has artificially elevated the costs of homeownership for residents of those neighborhoods.⁴

Homeowners need more help, not less, and the mortgage and servicing industry has proven to be particularly ill-equipped in providing it. A massive body of recent evidence exists which shows pervasive lender foreclosure processing problems and problems with mortgage transfers and assignments within the securitization process. These shortcomings show a deep disregard for legal requirements among lenders and servicers, and also demonstrate that they are badly understaffed, perform poorly, and lack accountability. Problems uncovered in the foreclosure process mirror the problems that homeowners seeking loan modifications have experienced: borrowers frequently report an inability to reach bank staff, loss of paperwork that they have sent in, and little oversight or enforcement.

We cannot leave the important job of foreclosure mitigation solely to an industry that

has repeatedly refused to do the job correctly. Just two days ago, HSBC suspended all foreclosures after an investigation by federal regulators uncovered "problems in the company's processing, preparation, and signing off of affidavits and other documents supporting foreclosures, and in HSBC's management of third-party law firms retained to carry out foreclosures."⁵ Rather than eliminating the only lifelines that help people from losing their homes, we should be increasing that help. It is irresponsible to eliminate these programs at a time when our nation needs them most.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

AFL-CIO,
Americans for Financial Reform,
Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law,
Center for NYC Neighborhoods,
Center for Responsible Lending,
Community Reinvestment Association of North Carolina,
Consumer Action,
Consumer Federation of America,
Empire Justice Center,
Family Equality Council,
HomeFree-USA,
The Leadership Conference,
NAACP,
National Association of Consumer Advocates,
National Community Reinvestment Coalition,
National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients),
National Fair Housing Alliance,
National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Action Fund,
National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty,
National Urban League,
Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project,
PICO National Network,
SEIU,
Woodstock Institute.

END NOTES

¹ See Bocian, D., K. Ernst, and W. Li, *Unfair Lending: The Effect of Race and Ethnicity on the Price of Subprime Mortgages*, Center for Responsible Lending, May 2006, p. 3. Available at www.responsiblelending.org.

² Center for Responsible Lending's *Fact Sheet on Predatory Mortgage Lending*, op. cit. See also HUD, *Unequal Burden: Income and Racial Disparities in Subprime Lending in America* (Washington, D.C.: HUD, 2000), and *The Impending Rate Shock*.

³ Squires, Gregory D., Derek S. Hyra, Robert N. Renner, "Segregation and the Subprime Lending Crisis," Paper presented at the 2009 Federal Reserve System Community Affairs Research Conference, Washington, DC (April 16, 2009) p.1.

⁴ For a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between race and access to prime, near prime, and subprime loans in a representative metropolitan area, see Institute on Race and Poverty, *Communities in Crisis: Race and Mortgage Lending in the Twin Cities* (February 2009). Available online at http://www.irpumn.org/uls/resources/projects/IRP_mortgage_study_Feb_11th.pdf

⁵ Bay, Carrie, "HSBC Suspends All U.S. Foreclosures," DSNews.com, March 1, 2011. <http://www.dsnews.com/articles/hsbc-suspends-all-us-foreclosures-2011-03-01>

MARCH 7, 2011.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman, Financial Services Committee, House of Representatives, 2129 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BACHUS: I am writing to express my strong opposition to H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)

Termination Act. NSP has helped cities across the country address and mitigate the deleterious effects that vacant and blighted properties have on neighborhoods and property values. As a result of the foreclosure crisis, communities throughout the country, including Los Angeles, face significant challenges as foreclosed homes create a vicious cycle of blight, neighborhood decay, and lower property values. NSP has been instrumental in helping to stem this downward spiral by addressing the negative effects of abandoned and foreclosed properties.

In the City of Los Angeles, where, over the past four years, we have an estimated 39,000 foreclosed properties, NSP has played a critical role stabilizing our fragile housing market and helping to construct and rehabilitate a total of 1,200 housing units. Furthermore, at a time when unemployment in our construction industry is at an all-time high, NSP has created more than 900 jobs spurring Los Angeles' economic recovery.

Given the economic challenges facing cities today, I urge the committee to continue funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Very truly yours,

ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA,
Mayor.

NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF
HOUSING PRESERVATION & DEVELOPMENT,

New York City, March 9, 2011.

Rep. SPENCER BACKUS, *Chairman*,
Rep. BARNEY FRANK, *Ranking Member*,
House Financial Services Committee, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

Re H.R. 839—"The HAMP Termination Act of 2011," H.R. 861—"NSP Termination Act"

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: I am writing this letter to express the City of New York's opposition to the above-referenced bills coming before the House Financial Services Committee. These measures would eliminate crucial foreclosure prevention and neighborhood stabilization support available to homeowners and communities grappling with the devastating effects of the foreclosure crisis here in New York City.

The Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP) has been an invaluable tool for homeowners throughout the city who have unsustainable mortgages.

Data shows us that permanent HAMP modifications have on average saved homeowners almost \$400 more in monthly payments than the savings achieved by non-HAMP modifications (\$1200 vs. \$828).

Of the permanent modifications reported by the Center for New York City Neighborhood's extensive network of service providers, 46% are HAMP modifications (479 out of 1036), which is on par with the national average of 41%, as reported by the OCC (<http://tinyurl.com/4qajkkkt>).

HAMP has had a tremendous impact in New York. In the NYC MSA, there have been 41,785 HAMP modifications (32,785 permanent and 9,000 active trials), which represents 6% of all HAMP activity nationwide.

Without HAMP foreclosure prevention efforts would be greatly diminished. HAMP has been critically important in moving the mortgage industry to make more affordable, sustainable modifications for homeowners who have the ability to stay in their homes. We know from counselors on the ground that the banks' own proprietary modifications have become more affordable and "HAMP-like" since the full roll-out of the program, further illustrating HAMP's impact. However, HAMP must be preserved because even as the quality of non-HAMP modifications improves, they are not nearly as beneficial as HAMP modifications.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) provides states and municipalities

with much-needed funds to stabilize neighborhoods hardest-hit by the foreclosure crisis. In NYC, we have used NSP funds to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed homes for resale as affordable housing.

NSP funds are reducing the city's stock of vacant, foreclosed homes that are a blight on communities. To date, we have acquired 65 homes that are in various stages of rehab, and on track to buy and restore 25 more. We are poised to launch a program that will offer NSP funds as downpayment assistance to encourage homeowners to buy foreclosed homes. These programs accomplish dual goals of incentivizing homeownership while also improving the housing stock in neighborhoods devastated by foreclosure.

NSP funding has also been used to assist multifamily, rental buildings in distress, providing long-term affordability for income-eligible families. As a result of the economic downturn, New York City is witnessing an increase in the number of rental buildings with deteriorating physical conditions, with many of these buildings in default on their mortgages. Addressing the needs of these properties is putting a strain on our typical funding sources, making NSP a particularly valuable tool. We have expended over \$3M of NSP funds on the acquisition of foreclosed multi-family buildings, creating over 200 affordable rental units in The Bronx and Brooklyn. At least \$10 million in future NSP funds will be targeted towards stabilizing some of the most distressed multi-family rental housing in the City.

As outlined here, the aforementioned programs offer critical assistance to New York City families and neighborhoods suffering from the harmful effects of the foreclosure crisis. These programs' positive impacts are extensive and they are compelling. To eliminate them now would be unwise. For these reasons, The City of New York opposes their termination.

Sincerely,

RAFAEL E. CESTERO,
Commissioner.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The gentleman might be interested to know that there was a HOPE VI bill that was an amendment to that, to H.R. 3524, made by Representative SESSIONS. The amendment sought to maintain HUD's authority to issue demolition only grants, and that failed by a recorded vote of 186-221. Voting "no" on that was the gentleman, Mr. FRANK and Ms. WATERS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

I have been listening to all of this, and I think that everybody knows, we all want to get the housing market back on track. We all want to be able to help those that are in trouble.

But many of my colleagues on the other side have said that if you end these programs there will be nothing, and that's just not true. Of the 4.1 million mortgage modifications that were completed, 3.5 million were done by the private sector with no government program and not a dime from the taxpayers. So there is a market out there.

There is also the Home Affordable Refinance Program, HARP, for homeowners. And don't forget the Hardest Hit Fund, which President Obama established. And in 2008, \$300 million in guarantees were committed for homeowners, a voluntary FHA program. \$475 million had been appropriated to

Neighbor Works for foreclosure counseling. And finally, there are countless local, State and private sector initiatives.

So let us not forget that this is being taken care of. And rather than have a program that really doesn't affect those that have been foreclosed on, it really is a program for counties, not-for-profits, for States, and it can cause incentives for banks and other lenders to foreclose on troubled borrowers, worsening and prolonging the housing credit crisis.

So let's get back to what this bill really does, and it doesn't help taxpayers.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 861 the "Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act". Mr. Chair, the termination of a program designed and dedicated to the stabilization of neighborhoods suffering through the foreclosure crisis is simply the wrong approach.

NSP was created to help stabilize communities that have suffered from foreclosures and abandonment. The program will continue to work towards accomplishing these goals by purchasing and redeveloping foreclosed and abandoned homes in communities that were distressed by the economic downturn. NSP grants provide much needed assistance to state and local governments to acquire, demolish and rehabilitate blighted properties.

NSP funds also help to redevelop hard-hit communities, create jobs and grow local economies. HUD estimates that NSP alone will support 93,000 jobs nationwide once fully implemented. Mr. Chair, with unemployment at 9 percent and many communities still seriously suffering from slow job growth, it is imperative that we support programs like NSP that create jobs.

Mr. Chair, vacant and blighted properties have a serious effect on neighborhoods and property values. The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Community Development Association and many others have spoke out in favor of NSP. I urge this body to listen to the voices from the people on the ground in these communities. H.R. 861 does not address the urgent needs of these distressed communities. I urge a no vote on H.R. 861.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act. The depth of our foreclosure crisis is astounding. According to Realty Trac we witnessed over one million foreclosures last year and they predict we are on track to break that unfortunate record once again this year.

Furthermore, the same group found that foreclosure proceedings were initiated against 2.9 million of our nation's households in 2010. They predict this number to increase by 20 percent this year.

With no apparent slowing of this trend, the Miami Valley region of Ohio has averaged roughly 7,000 foreclosures each of the last three years; there were more than 1100 foreclosures in just the first two months of this year. This is a three-fold increase from a decade ago.

This crisis hurts individuals, families, neighborhoods, and communities. In my area of

Ohio, the foreclosures were not due to an irresponsible home buying “boom and bust” cycle with dramatic increases and falling home values—but rather due to high unemployment caused by the deep recession; sharp declines in population, along with families who were victimized by predatory lenders and the lack of loan modification standards.

The result has been an almost doubling of the vacancy rate made up mostly of abandoned foreclosed properties. The City of Dayton currently has 15,000 vacant excess units with some neighborhoods seeing half of their units vacant.

Foreclosed properties sit vacant for long periods of time, and not only become an eyesore, but a threat to public health and safety. In response, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program was created to help address this crisis with which our communities struggle.

The resources that this program has brought to bear are continuing to make a considerable difference. Not only have hundreds of vacant units have been demolished, but the structures with value were rehabilitated and sold. In addition, the program has allowed localities to partner with local builders, trade schools for at-risk youth, universities and non-profits, to further leverage these funds.

I have stood on this floor and voted time and again to cut wasteful spending and terminate ineffective government programs, but I cannot vote to end the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. In Southeast Ohio NSP has proven its value and demonstrated its effectiveness at addressing one of the biggest problems to confront my communities.

In Southeast Ohio this program has removed long standing blight. It is positively affecting real estate values, training at risk youth and also creating jobs. For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 861, The Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose this spurious legislation to eliminate a program that has helped our towns and cities recover from the horrible housing crisis that has taken hold of these communities.

The intent of this program which I voted for was to stabilize neighborhoods. The legislation allowed hard-working American families in danger of losing their homes to refinance into lower-cost government-insured mortgages they can afford to repay.

I was able to hold foreclosure workshops in cities and towns throughout my district to help these families at risk of losing their homes. With my community's help, many families were able to stay in their homes, keeping neighborhoods intact.

I believe that more money should be used to keep people in their homes. To the administration's credit, they attempted to create other programs that would do that. The Republican majority has spent the last weeks attempting to eliminate those programs also.

The intent of the NSP legislation, begun more than three years ago, was to quickly and efficiently distribute funds to neighborhoods and communities that have a large number of foreclosed, vacant, or bank-owned properties. The local government's goal should be to utilize the funds to secure communities and neighborhoods that have unique needs as a result of the foreclosure crisis.

The use of non-governmental agencies in the NSP program was innovative. HUD could

have further been innovative and used rent to own to keep people in their homes.

NSP also seeks to prevent future foreclosures by requiring housing counseling for families receiving homebuyer assistance. HUD seeks to protect future homebuyers by requiring States and local grantees to ensure that new homebuyers under NSP receive homeownership counseling and obtain a mortgage loan from a lender who agrees to comply with sound lending practices.

Defeat this legislation and vote to keep people in their homes and our communities living and vibrant.

I would like to submit this article from the Florida Times-Union into the RECORD about the amount of Jacksonville homes underwater.

[From the Florida Times-Union, March 8, 2011]

NEARLY HALF OF JACKSONVILLE HOME MORTGAGES UNDERWATER AT END OF 2010

(By Kevin Turner)

MARCH 8.—Nearly half of mortgages residences in Jacksonville were underwater at the end of 2010—47 percent—primarily because their values have sunk below the amount their owners owe on their mortgages.

The phenomenon is also known as “negative equity.” According to real estate data aggregator CoreLogic, another 4.8 percent of all mortgaged Jacksonville mortgages were in “near negative equity” status, or owed the same or nearly the same as much as their homes were worth.

Combined, 51.8 percent of Jacksonville homes are underwater or nearly so, according to a report released today by real estate data aggregator CoreLogic.

Although sinking values are thought to be the chief cause, increases in mortgage debt are also a factor, CoreLogic noted.

The local combined underwater percentage is significantly higher than the national average of 27.9 percent of mortgaged homes nationwide that are underwater or near underwater. Some 23.1 percent were fully underwater.

The difference in the statistic locally and nationally underscores the lingering effects of bursting of the real estate value bubble in hardest-hit Florida, Nevada, Arizona and California.

The Associated Press also reported:

Nationally, the number of Americans who owe more on their mortgages than their homes are worth rose at the end of last year, preventing many people from selling their homes in an already weak housing market.

The percentage of homes underwater at the end of the fourth quarter, at 23.1 percent, was up from 22.5 percent, or 10.8 million households, in the third quarter.

The number of underwater mortgages nationally had fallen in the previous three quarters, mostly because more homes had fallen into foreclosure.

Underwater mortgages typically rise when home prices fall. Home prices in December hit their lowest point since the housing bust in 11 of 20 major U.S. metro areas. In a healthy housing market, about 5 percent of homeowners are underwater.

About 2.4 million people have only 5 percent equity or less in their homes, putting them near the tipping point if prices in their area fall.

Roughly two-thirds of homeowners in Nevada with a mortgage had negative home equity, the worst in the country. Arizona, Florida, Michigan and California were next, with nearly 50 percent of homeowners with mortgages in those states underwater.

Oklahoma had the smallest percentage of underwater homeowners in the October-De-

cember quarter, at 5.8 percent. Only nine states recorded percentages less than 10 percent.

When a mortgage is underwater, the homeowner often can't qualify for mortgage refinancing and has little recourse but to continue making payments in hopes the property eventually regains its value.

The slide in home prices began stabilizing last year. But prices are expected to continue falling in many markets due to still-high levels of foreclosure and unemployment.

That means homes purchased at the height of the real estate boom are unlikely to recover lost value for years.

Underwater mortgages also dampen home sales. Homeowners who might otherwise sell their home refuse to take a loss or can't get the bank to agree to a short sale—when a lender lets a borrower sell their property for less than the amount owed on the mortgage.

Home sales have been weaker in areas where there are a large number of homeowners with negative equity.

The total amount of negative equity increased to \$751 billion nationwide, up from \$744 billion in the previous quarter.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the Neighborhood Stabilization Termination Act, or H.R. 861, a bill to eliminate the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP). I would like to shed light on the positive impact the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has had on neighborhoods and communities across the country and particularly in Chicago, Illinois, as well as dispel myths my Republican colleagues have been passing off as the truth.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program is one of several programs targeted for elimination by House Republicans. These are programs that are helping middle-class and working-class Americans avoid losing their homes through the calamity of foreclosure. While imperfect, these programs are literally keeping a roof over people's heads, keeping families together, and preserving the fabric of American neighborhoods.

Let's not forget, Congress bailed out financial institutions when they hit rock bottom and Congress acted to shore up the economy when it was on the brink of a deeper crisis.

But now Republicans are saying we can't afford programs that lend a hand to American homeowners in their hour of greatest need? That's not the America I know, that's not the America that families need, and that is not the America we were sent to Washington to protect. Let's help our neighbors and our neighborhoods and not leave them to fend for themselves during these tough times.

Recently, several worthy and notable organizations, such as Chicanos Por la Causa (CPLC), have been specifically targeted by my Republican colleagues for the funds they've received under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. Let me make this clear, Chicanos Por La Causa is the lead applicant for a national consortium of non-profit affordable housing developers that have received federal funding to revitalize neighborhoods in eight states and the District of Columbia that have been negatively impacted by foreclosures and abandoned properties. CPLC, which was awarded \$137 million to address foreclosed and vacant properties, submitted one of the highest scoring grants. The grant to CPLC increased the equitable allocation of NSP funds by providing the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) with important

tools to help American communities. Specifically, it provided HUD with a method for investing through 13 consortium members in a mix of urban and rural communities that have been hardest hit by the foreclosure crisis, and in predominately Latino communities through organizations that provide culturally and linguistically competent services.

Currently, there are approximately 1.3 million Latinos who are in the process of foreclosure or have already lost their homes. There is no doubt the Latino community has been disproportionately affected by the foreclosure crisis. For this reason, Chicanos Por La Causa, together with the National Association for Latino Community Asset Builders, have helped blighted communities repair the devastation and distress that comes with abandoned properties. The Resurrection Project is one of the organizations under this consortium that is in my own backyard in Chicago. The Resurrection Project has served the Back of the Yards community in my district by investing \$12 million in NSP funds to help stabilize the community. Back of the Yards is one the poorest and most blighted communities in my district and one of the hardest hit by the foreclosure crisis. These funds will certainly assist with the recovery efforts and revitalize this historic neighborhood in the city of Chicago.

Mr. Chair, our nation is facing extraordinarily dire economic times. American homeowners, our neighborhoods, and our communities do not deserve to have Congress turn our backs on them in the hour of greatest need. I believe the Neighborhood Stabilization Program is vital to our states, to our cities, and to our communities that have been hardest hit by the largest housing crisis of our generation. This is why I am opposing the Neighborhood Stabilization Termination Act. Two weeks ago I submitted a letter for the record during the Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee hearing on foreclosure mitigation programs targeted for elimination. The letter was submitted on behalf of the National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Community Development Association, National Association for County Community and Economic Development, Council of State Community Development Agencies, and the Enterprise Community Partners, Inc., all of whom support this very valuable neighborhood revitalization program. I ask my colleagues to stand with our neighborhoods and our communities and vote no on this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program was established in 2008 to help stabilize communities across American that has suffered from foreclosures and abandonment.

Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds give states and local governments the tools needed to purchase and redevelop foreclosed and abandoned homes.

Without this funding whole neighborhoods suffer sliding real estate values, increases in crime, and decreases in the overall morale of its citizens.

From the total Neighborhood Stabilization Program appropriations of \$7 billion, HUD estimates that 100,000 properties in the hardest-hit areas will be impacted.

In my district, Dallas, Texas, a little over 7.9 million dollars was awarded through Neighborhood Stabilization Program funding.

At the beginning of the foreclosure crisis Dallas' housing market suffered from an average of 300 foreclosures a month.

The City of Dallas has identified 13 areas in the city that can benefit from this funding.

Without programs like the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, neighborhoods in my area would have nowhere else to turn.

Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds help to redevelop hard-hit communities, creates jobs, and grows local economies.

With nearly 14 million Americans out of a job, Americans need a Republican Congress that works to create jobs and strengthen the economy.

In the last 11 weeks, the House Republicans have passed reckless spending proposals estimated to destroy 700,000 jobs and stall our economic growth.

I encourage my colleague to stand by struggling neighborhoods and vote no on this measure.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) Termination Act. This bill stops in its tracks the successful efforts to rebuild neighborhoods hardest hit by the foreclosure crisis. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program has provided resources to allow cities and states to rehabilitate foreclosed and abandoned homes that are driving down home prices and destabilizing neighborhoods.

In Rhode Island, we were hit early and hard by the housing crisis. We currently have the fourth highest unemployment rate, and Rhode Islanders are struggling with mortgage payments due to the loss of jobs through no fault of their own. This program has provided the state with much needed resources to stabilize our housing market and create new low-income housing. Rhode Island housing agencies have warned me that ending this program would be detrimental to their efforts to build homes, save buildings, stabilize blighted neighborhoods, and most importantly, put Rhode Islanders to work.

In my district, \$800,000 out of Rhode Island's NSP funds went to creating a new building that houses 12 homeless veterans, a police station, and commercial space. This funding also helped create two additional apartments for homeless veterans in a nearby building that also includes a social services office for the residents. This legislation would stop projects that are already planned to create jobs that would support 90 affordable homes and apartments in the most at-risk neighborhoods.

Mr. Chair, without the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, Rhode Island would not have been able to undertake this remarkable partnership, as well as numerous other successful examples around the State that have brought together Federal, State, business and community organization efforts.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 861, which will terminate an important Federal response to the mortgage crisis that continues to threaten American economic growth.

Last week, House Republicans voted to terminate the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Refinance Program, a promising fore-

closure prevention program directed toward responsible homeowners. Today, we are considering terminating a program that helps stabilize communities rocked by massive foreclosure and home abandonment. With about 13.7 million Americans struggling with unemployment, I urge the Republican leadership to focus on creating jobs, not on terminating programs. It is time to be constructive, not destructive.

Mr. Speaker, I am starkly opposed to H.R. 861, which would terminate the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP). This important program provides grants to State and local governments and eligible entities to buy and restore abandoned and foreclosed properties. This funding allows the hardest hit communities, like those in my home state of Michigan, to start tearing down dilapidated properties with an eye toward shrinking struggling cities and rehabilitating healthy neighborhoods. This funding helps increase nearby property values and decrease the risk of foreclosure for remaining residents. It also enables communities to cut down on havens for criminal activity, reducing law enforcement costs. Several communities in my Congressional District, like Dearborn, Taylor, and Inkster have benefited from this program, and its continued funding is crucial for local governments to respond to the mortgage crisis. If my Republican colleagues refuse to believe NSP is a wise public investment, I extend an invitation for them to visit my home state and witness the critical impact this program has on hard-hit communities.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 861

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "NSP Termination Act".

SEC. 2. RESCISSION OF \$1 BILLION FUNDING FOR 3RD ROUND OF NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION PROGRAM.

Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, there are rescinded and permanently canceled all unobligated balances remaining available as of such date of enactment of the amounts made available by section 1497(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203; 124 Stat. 2209; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note).

SEC. 3. TERMINATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Sections 2301 through 2303 of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-289; 122 Stat. 2850; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note) are hereby repealed.

(b) TREATMENT OF REMAINING FUNDS.—

(1) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Notwithstanding the repeal under subsection (a), any amounts made available under the provisions specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall continue to be governed by any provisions of

law applicable to such amounts as in effect immediately before such repeal.

(2) REMAINING FUNDS.—The provisions specified in this paragraph are as follows:

(A) Section 2301(a) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-289; 122 Stat. 2850; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note).

(B) The second undesignated paragraph under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Planning and Development, Community Development Fund” in title XII of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5, 123 Stat. 217).

(c) TERMINATION.—Upon the obligation of all amounts made available under the provisions specified in subsection (b)(2), and outlays to liquidate all such amounts, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall terminate the Neighborhood Stabilization Program authorized under the provisions specified in subsections (a) and (b)(2).

SEC. 4. PUBLICATION OF MEMBER AVAILABILITY FOR ASSISTANCE.

Not later than 5 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall publish to its Website on the World Wide Web in a prominent location, large point font, and boldface type the following statement: “The Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) has been terminated. If you are concerned about the impact of foreclosed properties on your community, please contact your Member of Congress, State, county, and local officials for assistance in mitigating the impacts of foreclosed properties on your community.”

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in part B of House Report 112-34. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report (except that amendment No. 9 and amendment No. 10 may be offered only en bloc), may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

MOTION TO RISE

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELLISON moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I rise to make this motion today because I'm opposed to the underlying bill, the NSP Termination Act.

Mr. Chair, in the course of this debate on the termination of foreclosure mitigation programs, including this bill, we've been enmeshed in a huge debate around what the proper role of government is.

The Republican Caucus clearly thinks that government has no role, that citizens are on their own, and that no matter how much devastation a particular phenomenon like the foreclosure crisis has caused, that citizens just have no help in the government.

The government can't be there for them.

And, on the other hand, the Democratic Caucus, we believe that, in the proper circumstances, the government has an important role and does need to be there for the American people, and when we see property values dropping, whole neighborhoods destroyed, that we should do something about it.

This motion to strike the enacting clause, according to Rule XVIII, clause 9, “if carried in the House, shall constitute a rejection of the bill.”

And, Mr. Chair, I urge that we do reject this bill. This bill is an affront and an insult at a time when Americans have seen over 4 million foreclosures across this Nation, devastating whole communities, devastating communities and wiping out city and municipal budgets, so that cities, when they have abandoned properties in their neighborhoods, are left with tearing them down and demolishing them on the nickel of the taxpayer in that city when, in fact, this is a community-wide problem.

There's no money in many cities to do the demolition. So what will happen is that an old, burned-out hulk will sit there and sit there as neighbors look on and see the property values in their homes plummet. And what we'll see, Mr. Chair, is people leaving dogs there. Perhaps the house will be an attractive nuisance. Perhaps some crime will be committed there, drug dealing there, dead animals left there, and neighborhoods will fall deeper and deeper in despair.

I grew up in the city of Detroit. I'm honored to represent the Fifth District of Minneapolis today, but I grew up in the city of Detroit, and I saw how the foreclosures in that city ripped that town apart. And the good people of that city had to sit by and watch folks burn houses. They would put them on fire, and years later, no money to demolish them that the city had, and it just helped folks say that, You know what? I'm going to leave this city because I can't stand to live here with that big hulk right next to my home. Who's going to help out?

Well, according to the Republican Caucus, that's not the proper role of government. And this is really what this is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I've heard our friends in the Republican Caucus talk about jobs, yet they haven't introduced one single jobs bill, and we've been here for 11 weeks.

They talk about the deficit and go on and on ad nauseam about putting debt on our children and grandchildren. And yet, when they had the chance to raise revenue so that we could, in fact, pay the bills of this country, they were absolutely and adamantly opposed to it.

But now, when we see Americans have their neighborhoods slipping into oblivion, slipping into a situation where people can't live in their neighborhood and people can't sell their homes so they're just suffering, the Republican Caucus said, There's nothing we can do for you either.

□ 1520

They don't really demonstrate a commitment to jobs. They don't really demonstrate a commitment to even dealing with the deficit, at least not through revenue raising. They have a commitment to set Americans adrift, on their own.

I make this motion to correct the record on this Neighborhood Stabilization Program. This isn't a broken or ineffective program that should be eliminated. It is a vitally important program for local and State governments that need all the resources they can get to address neighborhoods that are overrun by foreclosures.

According to HUD, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has supported close to 100,000 jobs nationwide. They will be eliminated if we pass this bill. That's right. The Republicans, again, are cutting another 100,000 jobs for working Americans.

So, Mr. Chair, what does the Neighborhood Stabilization Program do?

It helps local and State governments renovate abandoned and foreclosed properties. It helps local governments revitalize communities instead of watching these neighborhoods deteriorate. It gives communities the ability to get back on their feet as quickly as possible.

In my district, the city of Minneapolis has put NSP funding to good use. Thomas Streitz is the director of Housing and Policy Development for the city of Minneapolis, and he explains: “The Neighborhood Stabilization Program has enabled the city of Minneapolis to stabilize neighborhoods throughout the city affected by foreclosure. Funding to date has impacted more than 530 properties, and with the additional funding sought, 56 more properties could be rehabilitated, bringing even more homeowners back into neighborhoods.”

I believe the NSP is a good investment.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 240, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

AYES—183

Ackerman	Blumenauer	Carney
Andrews	Boswell	Carson (IN)
Baca	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Baldwin	Braley (IA)	Chu
Barrow	Brown (FL)	Cioccine
Bass (CA)	Butterfield	Clarke (MI)
Becerra	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Berkley	Capuano	Clay
Bishop (GA)	Cardoza	Cleaver
Bishop (NY)	Carnahan	Clyburn

Connolly (VA) Johnson (GA)
 Conyers Johnson, E. B.
 Cooper Kaptur
 Costa Keating
 Costello Kildee
 Courtney Kind
 Critz Kissell
 Crowley Kucinich
 Cuellar Langevin
 Cummings Larsen (WA)
 Davis (CA) Larson (CT)
 Davis (IL) Lee (CA)
 DeFazio Levin
 DeGette Lewis (GA)
 DeLauro Lipinski
 Deutch Loebach
 Dicks Lofgren, Zoe
 Dingell Lowey
 Doggett Lujan
 Donnelly (IN) Lynch
 Doyle Maloney
 Edwards Markey
 Ellison Matheson
 Engel Matsui
 Eshoo McCarthy (NY)
 Farr McCollum
 Fattah McDermott
 Filner McGovern
 Frank (MA) McIntyre
 Fudge McNeerney
 Garamendi Meeks
 Gonzalez Michaud
 Green, Al Miller (NC)
 Green, Gene Miller, George
 Grijalva Moore
 Gutierrez Moran
 Hanabusa Murphy (CT)
 Hastings (FL) Napolitano
 Heinrich Neal
 Higgins Olver
 Himes Owens
 Hinchey Pallone
 Hinojosa Pascarell
 Hirono Pastor (AZ)
 Holden Payne
 Holt Pelosi
 Honda Peters
 Hoyer Peterson
 Inslee Pingree (ME)
 Israel Polis
 Jackson (IL) Price (NC)
 Jackson Lee Quigley
 (TX) Rangel

NOES—240

Adams Coffman (CO)
 Aderholt Cole
 Akin Conaway
 Alexander Cravaack
 Altmire Crawford
 Amash Crenshaw
 Austria Culberson
 Bachmann Davis (KY)
 Bachus Denham
 Bartletta Dent
 Bartlett DesJarlais
 Barton (TX) Diaz-Balart
 Bass (NH) Dold
 Benishek Dreier
 Berg Duffy
 Biggert Duncan (SC)
 Bilbray Duncan (TN)
 Bilirakis Ellmers
 Bishop (UT) Emerson
 Black Farenthold
 Blackburn Fincher
 Bonner Fitzpatrick
 Bono Mack Flake
 Boren Fleischmann
 Boustany Fleming
 Brady (TX) Flores
 Brooks Forbes
 Broun (GA) Fortenberry
 Buchanan Foxx
 Bucshon Franks (AZ)
 Buerkle King (IA)
 Burgess King (NY)
 Calvert Kingston
 Camp Gerlach
 Campbell Gibbs
 Canseco Gibson
 Cantor Gingrey (GA)
 Capito Gohmert
 Carter Goodlatte
 Cassidy Gosar
 Chabot Gowdy
 Chaffetz Granger
 Chandler Graves (GA)
 Coble Graves (MO)

Reyes
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Ross (AR)
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Marino
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Mack
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Larsen
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pearce

Berman
 Burton (IN)
 Cohen

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1549

Messrs. BENISHEK, MANZULLO, ALTMIRE, HELLER and TERRY and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas and RUPPERSBERGER and Ms. LEE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 112-34.

Mr. ELLISON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 4, before “Effective” insert “(a) RESCISSION.—”.

Page 5, after line 10, insert the following new subsection:

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF AMOUNTS SUBJECT TO POSSIBLE RESCISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has allocated funding to the States, including city, county, and municipal governments, under the 3rd round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, as set forth in paragraph (2). Amounts from the allocations set forth in paragraph (2) of this subsection will be subject to possible rescission and cancellation, to the extent provided in subsection (a).

(2) ALLOCATION.—The allocations set forth in this paragraph for the following States are the following amounts:

(A) Alaska: \$5,000,000.
 (B) Alabama: \$7,576,151.
 (C) Arizona: \$45,377,073.
 (D) Arkansas: \$5,000,000.
 (E) California: \$149,308,651.
 (F) Colorado: \$17,349,270.
 (G) Connecticut: \$9,322,756.

Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Posey
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Roskam
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

(H) District of Columbia: \$5,000,000.
 (I) Delaware: \$5,000,000.
 (J) Florida: \$208,437,144.
 (K) Georgia: \$50,421,988.
 (L) Hawaii: \$5,000,000.
 (M) Iowa: \$5,000,000.
 (N) Idaho: \$5,000,000.
 (O) Illinois: \$30,143,105.
 (P) Indiana: \$31,509,101.
 (Q) Kansas: \$6,137,796.
 (R) Kentucky: \$5,000,000.
 (S) Louisiana: \$5,000,000.
 (T) Massachusetts: \$7,387,994.
 (U) Maryland: \$6,802,242.
 (V) Maine: \$5,000,000.
 (W) Michigan: \$57,524,473.
 (X) Minnesota: \$12,427,113.
 (Y) Missouri: \$13,110,604.
 (Z) Mississippi: \$5,000,000.
 (AA) Montana: \$5,000,000.
 (BB) North Carolina: \$5,000,000.
 (CC) North Dakota: \$5,000,000.
 (DD) Nebraska: \$6,183,085.
 (EE) New Hampshire: \$5,000,000.
 (FF) New Jersey: \$11,641,549.
 (GG) New Mexico: \$5,000,000.
 (HH) Nevada: \$43,314,669.
 (II) New York: \$19,834,940.
 (JJ) Ohio: \$51,789,035.
 (KK) Oklahoma: \$5,000,000.
 (LL) Oregon: \$5,000,000.
 (MM) Pennsylvania: \$5,000,000.
 (NN) Puerto Rico: \$5,000,000.
 (OO) Rhode Island: \$6,309,231.
 (PP) South Carolina: \$5,615,020.
 (QQ) South Dakota: \$5,000,000.
 (RR) Tennessee: \$10,195,848.
 (SS) Texas: \$18,038,242.
 (TT) Utah: \$5,000,000.
 (UU) Virginia: \$6,254,970.
 (VV) Vermont: \$5,000,000.
 (WW) Washington: \$5,000,000.
 (XX) Wisconsin: \$7,687,949.
 (YY) West Virginia: \$5,000,000.
 (ZZ) Wyoming: \$5,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 170, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 1550

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The middle class is shrinking and deficits are rising because the Republicans are giving a pass to special interests who cheated homeowners and wrecked our economy. Instead of working to keep middle class families in their homes, the Republican plan is to foreclose on the American middle class. The American people sent us here to protect the American Dream, not to perpetuate a Wall Street nightmare. Democrats are standing with the American people to create good-paying American jobs and to keep them in their homes. Democrats are working to ensure that every American who wants a good job, can find one, and that middle class Americans can afford to buy a home and live the American Dream.

The legislation on the floor today proposes cutting funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. Republicans want to foreclose on the middle class, and my amendment forces Members to look at how this legislation will impact their State. So far, for each Member, if you read my amendment, you will see how much funding may be

cut from your State. My feeling is that before Republicans vote to cut funding for a successful housing program and a foreclosure mitigation program, they should know how much funding is at risk for their State and what the people back home are going to think about their vote.

This legislation to cut housing funding makes it clear that the majority is not focused on creating jobs. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program helps local communities redevelop abandoned and foreclosed properties, and that funding helps to create jobs. It takes workers to demolish an abandoned building.

Overall, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has created about 93,000 jobs. This legislation to cut NSP funding is just another bill offered up by the majority that will actually cut jobs. The unemployment rate is currently 8.9 percent. This rate is far too high. It is wasting human capital. People's skills and talents are sitting on the sidelines instead of being put to good use and earning a good paycheck. Unemployed Americans are ready to get back to work, and we must use every tool at our disposal to create new jobs.

Instead of creating jobs, the Republican majority is launching an attack on American workers and foreclosing on the American Dream. The Republican plan to cut funding and cut jobs won't help our economy. It's going to do the opposite. It's going to hold back our economic recovery. The continuing resolution passed last month by the majority would cut \$60 billion from programs and agencies that help the middle class and working families.

Economist Mark Zandi has estimated these cuts would result in the loss of 700,000 jobs. We can't afford to add to the already unacceptably high level of unemployment in this country. Republicans in Congress are pushing a reckless and irresponsible plan that protects tax breaks for millionaires and giveaways for corporate special interests at the expense of the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and to vote against the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I'm not opposed to this amendment. This amendment only deals with stage three of a project that should have only been one phase. Now, I wish they would have talked about phase two because I wish you would study where the money went on phase two. Because in phase two alone, we give away \$1.3 billion to nongovernment entities, incorporated businesses that are nonprofit.

But you have to say we did not stop a foreclosure. We just gave away in NSP2 \$1.3 billion. Of that, Neighborhood Lending Partners received \$50

million. They do not have to pay it back. Now, they can take that \$50 million—I'm sure they're a very reputable company. I'm not accusing anybody of anything. But they can sell those houses for any amount to whomever they want as long as it's below the price they have invested in business.

Community Builders, Inc., \$78.6 million; Los Angeles Neighborhood Housing, Services, Inc., \$60 million; Neighborhood Lending Partners of West Florida, Inc., \$50 million; Chicanos Por la Causa, Inc., \$137 million.

I wish we would have taken the time to review those and say how was the money spent, but HUD did some work for us. So let's see what HUD did.

HUG and OIG audited the State of Kansas Neighborhood Stabilization Program, NSP1, and found that the State improperly obligated more than \$12 million of its NSP1 funds. HUD and OIG audited the Sacramento Housing Redevelopment Agency of Sacramento, California, and found the agency did not administer its NSP funds in accordance with HUD rules and regulations. Specifically, it allowed ineligible properties to be rehabilitated; did not adequately monitor projects, which resulted in ineligible costs; permitted the developer to make unnecessary upgrades and overinflated construction budgets; did not ensure that it met the reporting requirements; and lacked management controls. I wish we would have audited this one in this amendment, too.

HUD and OIG audited the city and county of Denver, Colorado, NSP1, and found that the city improperly obligated more than \$1.5 of its NSP funds by recording its funds as obligated. HUD and OIG reviewed the city of Chattanooga, Tennessee, and found that the city generally administered its program, however sometimes inconsistent with identifying obligations and was not always accurate on reporting to HUD. On Louisville, Kentucky, again, very similar to the previous.

Augusta, Georgia. Did not have internal controls in place to perform continuous and routine monitoring of its obligation process to ensure its obligations were processed as intended. HUD and OIG reviewed Clark County, Nevada NSP and found that Clark County needs to revise its written procedures and developer agreements to ensure that properties to be sold to eligible home buyers will be sold at a price permitted by NSP requirements, which means they probably were selling it at too much money.

So although I do support the amendment at hand, I wish it would have reviewed phase one and two.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Two particular points, Mr. Chair. One is that, first of all, there's never been a program from any State, Federal, or local program that did not need review. I can tell you that in the city of Minneapolis, and in many other places,

this program has been high quality and has been well, well run.

Now, the question is interesting because if the gentleman wanted to talk about inefficiencies in a program, we could talk about fixing those programs. We're not talking about fixing the NSP program. We're talking about eliminating it. So I think if this was a sincerely made point, that we would be talking about how we can improve the program. We should mend it, not end it.

Secondly, this amendment that I'm offering tries to inform Members as to the losses that their communities will endure by cutting the program. This program elimination will be felt across America in local communities where foreclosures are happening, and in those particular communities Members should know what is going to happen: that expenditures for demolishing and rehabilitating abandoned homes are not going to be there any more. And I think it's important the Members should know. And I think it's important that the people who live in the Members' communities should know.

And so I ask that the amendment be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I disagree. It's not time to amend and pretend. It's time to end.

The problem with this program is I highlighted you a few violations, but it's really hard to violate the program requirements because there are so few requirements. It says, We're going to give you money. You can buy property, you can demolish houses. You can buy property, you can rehabilitate those properties. You have vast guidelines on how you rehabilitate them. In fact, an organization is not even required to have competitive bids. I can say I need some framing done, I can lend a sole source contract. Only one person applied—that's the person I asked to apply—and I can pay them the moneys I deem appropriate.

It says you have to sell the house for less than you have in it. It doesn't say you should attempt to try to sell at fair market value, although I have given you a list previously of how much you can make, which is quite a bit of money, and buy these houses. It just says you cannot sell them for more. It does not restrict them on who you sell them to; it does not restrict on whose affiliation you have that might be buying them. In fact, it's almost impossible to have a conflict of interest because there's conflict designed within the bill.

So we can say let's amend and pretend, but let's just end.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HURT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 112-34.

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 10, after the period add the following: "All such unobligated balances so rescinded and permanently canceled should be retained in the General Fund of the Treasury for reducing the budget deficit of the Federal Government."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 170, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HURT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. MILLER, Chairman BACHUS and Chairman BIGGERT, for their leadership on this very important issue.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program is another misdirected, multibillion-dollar bailout that hurts struggling homeowners by incentivizing lenders to foreclose properties rather than continue to work with those who are facing tough economic challenges.

At a time when our Nation faces over \$14 trillion in debt, \$1.6 trillion in deficit spending, and we are borrowing over 40 cents on every dollar we spend, we cannot continue to have taxpayers foot the bill for these unaccountable government programs that do nothing to solve the problems for which they were originally intended and harm our economic recovery. That is why I am offering an amendment to H.R. 861 which would direct all unobligated funds to be returned to the Treasury to reduce the deficit of the Federal Government once the program is terminated.

The people of Virginia's Fifth District called for serious and bold change last November. By working to reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government, save taxpayer dollars and rein in out-of-control spending, we are listening to the people and taking the first steps to change the culture in our Nation's Capitol so that we can grow the economy and create jobs for all central and southside Virginians and all Americans.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's any-

body exactly in opposition to the amendment because it doesn't do anything, but there is some opposition to the rhetoric; so I will claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's speech.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. In the first place, there is a consistent misunderstanding on the Republican side manifested by their talking about this as a program that there was foreclosed property. That, of course, allows them conveniently to pretend that, for every piece of property that a city is stuck with, there is an entity that stood behind it that foreclosed and can be sued. But that's not true.

This is not only about foreclosed property. It is about foreclosed and abandoned property, and there is property that has been abandoned. It has been abandoned by the owner who's walked away. It has been abandoned by some financial institutions that did not have the substance of banks. There is demonstrably property in the cities which cannot be traced.

The chairman of the committee displayed a picture before of a beat-up piece of property and said, Look at this piece of property. It's so far gone, who would want to buy it?

We said, No one would. It should be demolished. Tell us who owns it.

He said, You can always find out who owns it—except for that piece of property.

So it's not just about foreclosed property. Somebody has to demolish property where there is no owner. Somebody has to demolish property where there is no responsible party standing behind it. I just left the Chamber to meet with three firefighters from the city of Fall River in my district. They were appalled at the notion that they would be left in the city of Fall River to deal with abandoned property, which is a set of fire traps, and not have any help. So for that reason, I believe that we ought to be clear that this is not about only foreclosed property. And some property, by the way, has been foreclosed upon by entities that are bankrupt, by entities that have no funds.

The other point I would make, though, is this. I do agree with my colleagues that we should do something about the deficit. Now, I wish that they listened to that when we subsidized agriculture or when we sent money to Afghanistan and Iraq for their social purposes. But I have an alternative. I will repeat again, and they'll ignore it all day, I know. In the bill that originally authorized this billion dollars, we required that it be funded not by the general revenues but by a special assessment on financial institutions that have \$50 billion or more in assets and hedge funds at \$10 billion.

Now let's be clear, Mr. Chairman. Members on the other side know this bill is unlikely to become law. Indeed, some have even said they understand the money will be spent before it can

move. So the billion dollars is almost certainly going to be spent. My colleagues now have a choice. They can allow it to be spent by the taxpayers, or they can reconsider their opposition to our proposal of last summer and assess this on the large financial institutions and hedge funds. By the way, some of it, it is true, was caused by banks and some of it will go to banks.

But here's the answer. Instead of complaining that some of this will go to banks, join us and have it all come from banks and from hedge funds. But please, Mr. Chairman, let's not perpetuate the myth that, for every piece of property with which our poorer cities and rural areas are burdened, there is somebody they can go and sue and get it down. In fact, the gentleman from California himself has said, well, they can get a bulldozer and tear it down. Those bulldozers cost money. The people driving the bulldozers cost money.

So we believe that the approach should be to take money from the large financial institutions and from the hedge funds and take the billion dollars from them and provide it to municipalities and groups like Habitat for Humanity and others who will use it either to tear down the property, in some cases, or rehabilitate the property and make it affordable housing.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the choice between us. Again, I want to stress, this notion that it is only foreclosed property is a misstatement with a purpose, because it means that you ignore the fact that much of the property existing in the cities is abandoned and will only be dealt with by the city spending its own money or, by our preferred mode, having the large financial institutions and the hedge funds join us.

So I hope at some point today, one member of the majority will tell us whether or not they agree, Mr. Chairman, that if this program survives, we should get it not from the taxpayer and not from the property taxpayers of our cities or rural areas but from the large financial institutions. That's what I hope will happen.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Thank you for yielding.

I totally support the gentleman from Virginia's amendment. This is doing the right thing. It is saying, we're going to take a billion dollars back of your money, the taxpayers, and we're going to pay off the deficit that we've created for you.

It's about time we start paying down the debt. We cannot continue to spend dollars we don't have. Forty percent of every dollar we spend today is financed through the Treasury because we don't have the money. We're spending deficit dollars and it has to stop.

But I want to return to the argument that my good friend makes. And I respect my good friend. He knows that.

Somebody owned a home sometime, someplace, somewhere. Now, the individual who owned it, because it wasn't created by a miracle. Somebody built the house, somebody sold it to somebody, the individual might have gotten a loan on it from the bank. If the individual defaulted on the loan, the bank might have taken the house back. But the Federal Government and the local agencies look at taxes. We look at income taxes. The local governments, the city, the county, looks at property taxes. Somebody, some institution, is listed on the property tax bill.

Now, at some point in time, they're going to continue to notice the owner, whoever it might be. If it's an heir, you're going to get a notice, and it's going to say you did not pay your property taxes. At some point in time, that piece of property, home, vacated, abandoned, whatever it may be, is going up for a sale for property taxes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. What if it is abandoned and it is of not much value and has to be torn down, so people buy it and tear it down?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I reclaim the balance of my time.

If it's a public safety issue, a local government has a right to demolish property based on public safety. That assessment could be placed against the tax bill. At some point in time, the local government, if they so choose, if nobody wants to pay a dollar for that property, can buy it based on the tax basis for a dollar. The problem with that is, once the government entity buys the property, it's taken off the tax rolls.

Some of my colleagues have talked about police and fire and the benefit to them. The worst thing you can do is eliminate funding through taxation to police and fire.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I would be happy to.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. We were told, for instance, by Detroit and Cleveland, they have abandoned property. There is no owner they can find. Who's going to pay to knock it down?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I reclaim the balance of my time.

If you go to any title company, it will list who the owner of record is. Regardless, if you can find that entity or individual, it will list it. Regardless of who it is, at some point in time, it goes to a tax sale.

□ 1610

At that point in time, the local government or an investor can buy it at a much reduced price for just the tax lien against it, and if it's abandoned and demolished and not worth anything, the tax bill is going to be very low. So somebody can pick up a very good deal

on a piece of property by waiting for a tax sale. But if they choose not to and they want to go out and just buy it as a city or a county, they can do that and get a very good deal on it. So to assume that because nobody can find an owner out there, somebody is listed, and the government has a right to foreclose based on taxes.

I ask for an "aye" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the voice vote by which amendment No. 1 was rejected be vacated to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The earlier voice vote is vacated.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 112-34.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has assisted local governments across the United States in alleviating many of the impacts of abandoned and foreclosed properties, including the increased code enforcement, maintenance, and demolition costs resulting from abandoned and/or foreclosed properties;

(2) the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has assisted local governments across the United States in alleviating many of the impacts of abandoned and foreclosed properties, including the decreased property tax revenues due to unpaid property taxes on abandoned and/or foreclosed properties;

(3) the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has supported 93,000 jobs nationwide and impacted over 100,000 properties across the country;

(4) the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, including the third round of funding made available by section 1497(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, provides funding for State and local governments to redevelop abandoned and foreclosed homes; and

(5) by voting to terminate the Neighborhood Stabilization Program under this Act without a suggested replacement, the Congress is eliminating an effective program that has been used to provide affordable housing, create jobs, leverage private investment, and improve communities.

Page 5, line 1, strike "SEC. 2." and insert "SEC. 3."

Page 5, line 11, strike "SEC. 3." and insert "SEC. 4."

Page 6, line 17, "SEC. 3." and insert "SEC. 5."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 170, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, the middle class is shrinking and deficits are rising because the Republicans are giving a pass to special interests who cheated some homeowners and wrecked our economy. Instead of working to keep the middle class families in their homes, the Republican plan is to foreclose on the American middle class.

The amendment I have right here in front of you describes findings which talk about the positive benefits of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. This program is a good program, and no matter what may happen here today, the record should reflect the benefits of this program. This program was good, and the amendment offers language which sets forth findings, and the findings state the positive impacts of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, including assisting local governments, supporting jobs, and impacting approximately 100,000 properties.

The highlights of this amendment about the Neighborhood Stabilization Program talk about the positive benefits to the communities that the Neighborhood Stabilization Program benefited—it helped local governments, and the fact is, Mr. Chair, local governments really did benefit from this program, and the record should reflect and the bill should report language that talks about those benefits.

I'd like to just say this as well, Mr. Chair. The fact is that it is true that once an abandoned property is sitting there on the tax rolls after a certain amount of time somebody may at some point buy it, as the gentleman on the other side says. But what happens in the meantime? In the meantime, the grass grows, dead cats and dogs get left there. In the meantime, the windows are broken. In the meantime, people's property values plummet. In the meantime, we have an attractive nuisance where young people might be pulled in and taken advantage of. Horrible stories have happened, Mr. Chair.

So the gentleman has been right in his argument that sometime in the future maybe somebody will buy this rundown, abandoned, stripped-out property with no copper left in it, with neighbors who have just been decimated in the value of their homes, but that would be a far cry from what we could do. And if we're going to terminate this program, which has helped so many local governments, we should at least put language and findings in the record which reflect the positive aspects of this program, including the 93,000 jobs that we're getting rid of and

the 100,000 properties that we've already helped, and the more that we could help.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. If you want to talk about attractive nuisances, let's talk about next April when people have to pay their taxes. You're going to find out that government has become an incredible attractive nuisance to most people.

We're talking about middle class is shrinking, yeah, we're taxing them to death, and we're not only taxing them to death, but we're spending money on programs like this that is not an investment but is just a giveaway of tax dollars. Now we say we can't find the data to support that we bought 100,000 properties, but let's say we bought 100,000 properties. Somebody has the money, the \$6 billion going on \$7 billion, that we've given them. That's about 20,000 homes per State. Now you break that down to high-impact counties, compared to the millions of homes out there that are in foreclosure, these 100,000 homes have already been abandoned or foreclosed. I will say abandoned because the other side of the aisle wants to talk about abandoned homes, but they're homes that somebody does not live in anymore, and the people who lost them, yes, they lost them.

And how many jobs were created? Nobody can definitively give me a number because nobody knows for sure how much money was spent on jobs. Now, we can say we spent \$6 billion, but understand clearly, we bought properties with the bulk of that money. Now, how much money did we spend after the local groups, the non-profits took 17 percent off the top for overhead and expenses, how much did we spend for jobs? Now, if we had taken that \$6 billion, going on \$7 billion, and invested it in residential construction, just \$1 billion, as I said, in residential construction creates \$5.5 million in wages. It creates \$1.98 billion in spending on goods and services as a result of the new earnings and profits that were created through that.

Now, those goods and services, those companies employ workers. The wages are paid to workers. So you can definitively come up with a number based on a \$1 billion investment that we would generate in the economy. Now, we spent \$6 billion, and if we were able to create what \$1 billion would have created in private residential construction, we're probably lucky, but the problem with that is investing in residential construction is different than giving \$6 billion away of the taxpayers' money.

Now, the people listening to this debate understand, when you write your check to the Federal Government next month, we just gave away \$6 billion of it, we're going to give away another

billion. Now, that infuriates me. I would assume it infuriates you. You tell me, middle class America, what this does to help you? I told you the amounts earlier of how much you can earn to buy a house or how little you might have to pay for the house, depending on whoever bought the house what they want to charge and who they want to sell it to.

So the basis I would argue here is the amendment does nothing. I oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. May I inquire as to the remaining time?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, let me only add this: that this language, which should be put in the bill and this amendment calls for, sets forth in the record the positive impacts of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which should be memorialized in the bill, things like job creation, saving the neighborhood, saving local governments exorbitant costs. The Republican caucus has not created a single job, and now they're even eliminating jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1620

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. The facts speak for themselves. When you can say \$1.3 billion was given away to nongovernmental agencies—and I have listed the groups, and I have told you how many millions of your dollars were given to these groups that they get to keep—they are not coming back to us right now. These people are going to keep these moneys, and there is a wide array of things they can use them for. This was a bad investment. In fact, it was not an investment. It was a bad giveaway.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 112-34.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that, if the amounts that are rescinded and canceled under section 2 of this Act were instead made available under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program authorized under the provisions of law specified in subsections (a) and (b)(2) of section 3 of this Act, the Congress could have helped to rebuild neighborhoods throughout the United States where foreclosures on home mortgage loans are common.

Page 5, line 1, strike "SEC. 2." and insert "SEC. 3."

Page 5, line 11, strike "SEC. 3." and insert "SEC. 4."

Page 6, line 17, "SEC. 3." and insert "SEC. 5."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 170, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment.

My amendment would state simply that the Congress acknowledges that we could have helped to rebuild neighborhoods where foreclosures are common through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, or as we know it, NSP.

You see, my Republican colleagues are offering today a bill that would terminate NSP. This program, I believe, has been particularly successful in helping to rebuild neighborhoods in my district and throughout Orange County, California. The city of Anaheim, which I represent, acquired and rehabilitated 17 single-family homes and sold them to low- to moderate-income families.

It also acquired and rehabilitated a four-unit multifamily complex for lease to persons with developmental disabilities. This project was crucial because it is very difficult to find properties for people who have developmental disabilities.

In Anaheim, one in 303 homes is in foreclosure. Not only does this have an emotional impact, as you can imagine, when you lose your home—it is the instability, especially for your kids; parents are worried, and children can see that—but it also has economic impacts on our neighborhoods. With the help of this program, the city of Anaheim improved neighborhoods and provided the families with homes.

And I know that my colleague on the Republican side also represents Anaheim. And if he would have spoken to some of the staff from Anaheim, he would have realized that they really believe that this program was important to keep blight from happening in neighborhoods and to attempt to keep the prices of the homes level for those families that were struggling to make their payments and to stay in their homes and to keep up their neighborhoods.

The city of Garden Grove, where one in 348 homes is in foreclosure, also acquired and rehabilitated property. They acquired and rehabilitated five

homes and sold them to first-time home buyers. And, of course, the city of Santa Ana, where one in 252 homes is in foreclosure, they acquired and rehabilitated 13 single-family homes and 27 condos, and they sold them to first-time home buyers. They acquired and renovated a 13-unit multifamily complex and have leased them now to low-income families. They assisted five families with down payment assistance, and they are also in the process of acquiring 16 single-family homes that will be sold to first-time home buyers.

Now, I know that my colleague on the other side mentioned that some of this money went to nongovernmental agencies, to private companies; but I would like him to really take a look at the fact that cities really stepped up to work very hard to keep families in their homes, to keep neighborhoods afloat as we work through this very difficult time of the financial meltdown and the housing crisis.

In Orange County, the Neighborhood Housing Services, with the assistance of what we call NSP Round One moneys, acquired and rehabilitated a total of 11 single-family homes and condos. And with Round Two moneys, the Neighborhood Housing Services acquired and rehabilitated 17 single-family homes/condos and sold them to first-time home buyers.

This program has helped to rebuild our neighborhoods, to stabilize our neighborhoods, and have given families the opportunity to become homeowners. So it is my hope that my colleagues on the other side reconsider eliminating what I believe has been a successful program in Orange County, California, one that has benefited not just those who got to buy their first home but those neighborhoods and those cities that so desperately needed to keep up the neighborhood and get people in their homes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend, she mentioned the Neighborhood Housing Services of Orange County. They got \$7.5 million for 17 houses. Orange County, overall in the whole county, got \$4.3 million for the whole county. You have to say, is that a good investment? We have spent \$6 billion on this program, and we're saying, let's not spend the last billion. And Congress could have rebuilt neighborhoods. There is only \$1 billion left.

Now I don't see that the U.S. neighborhoods have been rebuilt for \$6 billion. I see \$6 billion that has been given away of taxpayers' moneys. And Orange County itself, which is a huge area, irrespective of the few examples that were given by my good friend, only got \$4.3 million. That's not equitable.

San Bernardino County, one of the hardest hit counties in this country, got a mere \$33.2 million. One of the hardest hit. That's the county. That had to go to all these cities that did not receive any distribution in NSP1 or NSP2, nothing. And they're having to take—and in Orange County, with \$4.3 million—take that and distribute it to all these cities that did not receive a dime. That's not fair.

And to say that we spent \$6 billion—and all the counties and cities haven't been rehabilitated, it's obvious—and to say we're going to spend \$1 billion more, and that's going to solve the problem? No, it's not. It's just going to take it and put us another \$1 billion in debt that our children and our grandchildren are going to have to pay for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the gentleman from California that some cities, it's true, did not receive moneys and did not go through the process of buying up homes, et cetera, and trying to get neighborhoods back. One of the reasons they did not is it's really a competitive situation. You have to want to do it, and some cities simply did not have the need or did not want to do it. I mean, I would assume that in some places in Orange County, you could probably do as the gentleman said, and that is to sell at a fire sale some of those homes on Newport Beach or other places.

But with respect to the central portion of Orange County where you really have households that are working families, this program was very, very important; and the city stepped up. The city of Anaheim, the city of Garden Grove, the city of Santa Ana stepped up to do the right thing to work through and to ensure that their neighborhoods again were stabilized and to get new people into those homes. Again, I do believe that it worked for those cities, and I would encourage a "yes" vote on this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The problem I have with the program—I have just mentioned San Bernardino County; and according to the county, there is no one at the county level that would support the current NSP program. And they state very specifically the county might have supported the concept of NSP, but this is before they fell victim to a complete lack of direction from HUD, mixed messages from HUD, and gross misallocations of the awards that were released. And the county, in support of my bill, said, We believe it is a means for Congress to get its financial house in order, just like the challenges we are facing at the local government level.

□ 1630

And not only is government facing challenges, the American people are

facing challenges. They're working hard. They're trying to support their families. They're trying to make their house payments. Nothing in this last billion dollars will stop one foreclosure from occurring.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, look, I've been a Member now of this august body for 75-some days. And I'm starting to learn much of what we do seems to be more based in theater than reality.

If I read this amendment correctly, what we're trying to do here is add language that basically says, well, we could repair neighborhoods with the last billion dollars. Of course it didn't happen with the previous money.

But think about it, if we take a step back. What's the money been used ultimately for? It's been used to bail out lenders. In many ways this is another back-door bailout to the very folks that my constituents are furious with, and handing them more government dollars in the name that, well, this time we passed the cash to those lenders, but this time we did it through local governments.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 112-34.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this Act shall take effect on, and any reference in this Act to the date of the enactment of this Act shall be construed to refer to, the earlier of the following dates:

(1) The date of the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The first date occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act on which both of the following conditions exist:

(A) The percentage of existing mortgages on 1- to 4-family residential properties located in the United States and under which the outstanding principal balance exceeds the value of the property subject to the mortgage is 10 percent or less.

(B) In the case of the State that, on such date, has the highest percentage, among all States, of existing mortgages on 1- to 4-family residential properties located in the State and under which the outstanding principal balance exceeds the value of the property subject to the mortgage, such percentage for such State is 15 percent or less.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 170, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

In Nevada the percentage is 67 percent. In Arizona it's 48.6 percent. In Florida it's 45.5 percent. And in Mr. MILLER's and mine, our great State, California, it's 31.6 percent.

And then finally, when we look at some of the groups that are supporting these programs, it's not about who's on this side of the aisle and who's on the

Very truly yours,
ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA,
Mayor.

State	Properties With a Mortgage Outstanding					\$ Outstanding			
	Mortgages	Negative Equity Mortgages	Equity Mortgages	Negative Equity Share	Near** Negative Equity share	Total Property Value	Mortgage Debt Outstanding	Net Homeowner Equity	Loan-to-Value Ratio
Alabama	340,665	35,610	19,188	10.5%	5.6%	65,482,055,550	43,970,078,384	21,511,977,166	67%
Alaska	87,286	7,801	5,160	8.9%	5.9%	23,773,756,773	15,920,518,570	7,853,238,203	67%
Arizona	1,333,398	648,387	63,304	48.6%	4.7%	263,693,025,194	243,760,655,061	19,932,370,133	92%
Arkansas	238,011	27,580	14,360	11.6%	6.0%	37,303,484,103	27,450,225,612	9,853,258,491	74%
California	6,870,914	2,172,700	299,067	31.6%	4.4%	2,864,273,476,858	2,008,766,937,342	855,506,539,516	70%
Colorado	1,125,434	221,097	91,187	19.6%	8.1%	301,289,945,528	217,120,459,818	84,169,485,710	72%
Connecticut	816,560	97,244	29,957	11.9%	3.7%	294,814,146,661	171,517,175,208	123,296,971,453	58%
Delaware	179,322	23,906	8,937	13.3%	5.0%	47,059,588,802	31,949,546,484	15,110,042,318	68%
Florida	4,459,951	2,029,128	182,323	45.5%	4.1%	853,646,775,841	757,212,788,734	96,433,987,107	89%
Georgia	1,605,825	449,971	120,854	28.0%	7.5%	319,934,838,691	255,319,644,351	64,615,194,340	80%
Hawaii	229,600	24,664	8,280	10.7%	3.6%	117,791,198,842	65,339,432,694	52,451,766,148	55%
Idaho	243,589	61,566	12,927	25.3%	5.3%	48,204,517,879	35,737,930,659	12,466,587,220	74%
Illinois	2,227,602	431,050	108,239	19.4%	4.9%	534,999,520,161	377,625,407,977	157,374,112,184	71%
Indiana	603,484	68,196	28,936	11.3%	4.8%	91,672,823,585	64,195,877,062	27,476,946,523	70%
Iowa	334,689	28,976	14,366	8.7%	4.3%	51,019,867,858	34,150,823,254	16,869,044,604	67%
Kansas	295,839	32,787	16,284	11.1%	5.5%	53,431,665,604	37,737,206,158	15,694,459,446	71%
Kentucky	279,187	24,880	14,092	8.9%	5.0%	47,549,597,328	32,335,774,221	15,213,823,107	68%
Louisiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maryland	1,358,672	298,554	67,580	22.0%	5.0%	433,409,001,574	298,109,259,531	135,299,742,043	69%
Massachusetts	1,494,099	222,559	51,704	14.9%	3.5%	546,053,917,907	329,062,834,394	216,991,083,513	69%
Michigan	1,381,232	519,716	76,403	37.6%	5.5%	198,169,103,537	169,373,043,369	28,796,060,168	80%
Minnesota	554,535	90,090	27,608	16.2%	5.0%	124,901,317,584	81,787,965,185	43,113,352,399	65%
Missouri	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	779,328	122,543	44,131	15.7%	5.7%	137,735,363,892	98,445,466,785	39,289,897,107	71%
Nebraska	112,444	6,650	3,939	7.7%	3.5%	28,244,797,730	16,968,913,610	11,275,884,120	60%
Nevada	221,686	21,388	13,072	9.6%	5.9%	35,462,342,354	25,920,022,837	9,542,319,517	73%
New Hampshire	586,515	390,192	23,037	66.5%	3.9%	103,720,996,430	123,072,698,809	-19,351,702,379	119%
New Jersey	211,489	37,488	11,351	17.7%	5.4%	51,974,243,397	35,837,313,271	16,136,930,126	69%
New Mexico	1,882,603	286,293	78,230	15.2%	4.2%	678,172,085,088	415,710,918,011	262,461,167,077	61%
New York	234,004	29,375	10,847	12.6%	4.6%	55,009,963,072	36,551,762,344	18,458,200,728	66%
North Carolina	1,838,917	129,633	40,013	7.0%	2.2%	835,125,621,032	415,765,632,474	419,359,988,558	50%
North Dakota	1,521,406	160,007	101,945	10.5%	6.7%	317,535,658			

TABLE 1: NEGATIVE EQUITY BY STATE*—Continued

State	Properties With a Mortgage Outstanding					\$ Outstanding			
	Mortgages	Negative Equity Mortgages	Equity Mortgages	Negative Equity Share	Near** Negative Equity share	Total Property Value	Mortgage Debt Outstanding	Net Homeowner Equity	Loan-to-Value Ratio
Virginia	1,252,705	276,910	73,763	22.1%	5.9%	419,006,811,369	295,429,338,477	123,577,472,892	71%
Washington	1,407,416	209,577	75,920	14.9%	5.4%	441,789,933,181	292,406,352,738	149,383,580,443	66%
Washington, DC	100,340	15,240	4,513	15.2%	4.5%	49,085,895,573	28,782,522,751	20,303,372,822	59%
West Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	619,792	81,267	30,026	13.1%	4.8%	120,246,415,775	80,769,544,053	39,476,871,722	67%
Wyoming	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nation	47,871,838	10,780,236	2,376,159	22.5%	5.0%	12,711,358,863,378	8,850,515,659,256	3,860,843,204,122	70%

* This data only includes properties with a mortgage. Non-mortgaged properties are by definition not included.

** Defined as properties within 5% of being in a negative equity position.

Source: CoreLogic. The data provided is for use only by the primary recipient or the primary recipient's publication. This data may not be re-sold, republished or licensed to any other source, including publications and sources owned by the primary recipient's parent company without prior written permission from CoreLogic. Any CoreLogic data used for publication or broadcast, in whole or in part, must be sourced as coming from CoreLogic, a real estate data and analytics company. For questions, analysis or interpretation of the data contact Lori Guyton at lgyton@civic.com or Bill Campbell at bill@campbelllewis.com. Data provided may not be modified without the prior written permission of CoreLogic. Do not use the data in any unlawful manner. This data is compiled from public records, contributory databases and proprietary analytics, and its accuracy is dependent upon these sources.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I guess the question should be how long do we need to wait? How many more billions of dollars needs to be given away? We've already spent \$6 billion. I guess we could spend more if somebody wanted to.

And when we talk about phasing out a program, it speaks to the argument that we need to spend more money on a program and continue the program. I think we've already spent too much money.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. MILLER, the question that was asked is how long we should wait. In my amendment that's my exact point. It's not how long we should wait; it's whether it's needed or not. So if we find that the mortgages are above 10 or 15 percent, then the program should exist.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I reclaim my time. On this issue, how long we wait is predicated on how much we are going to spend. And my colleagues on this side of the aisle believe the American people, the taxpayers have given too much of their money away, and they are saying we want it stopped, and we want you to be responsible for this money.

If this were our dollars, and we're getting in her purse and my wallet and handing the money out, that's a prerogative we have. That's not what's occurring, other than we are taxpayers too.

We've just got our hands in your pocket and your purse and spent your money on a giveaway program.

I ask for a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chair, in regards to the comments that have been recently stated, for the largest city that's in our State of California, from Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, he states that the NSP has helped cities

across the country to address and mitigate the terrible effects of what this crisis has done.

In closing, what I would also say is that my amendment is really building upon what I hope both sides of the aisle would consider, and that is, this program should be based upon if there is a need, then it should assist. If there is no longer a need, then I would support phasing it out.

And what I would also say is that the key point to keep in mind is, when we're looking at this program, this program, people need—it's for the counties and the cities to determine to be able to help improve their programs. And that's the way the program is intended. And if there's unintended consequences or things that can be done to support the program, I would work with my colleague on the other side of the aisle to fix those changes.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for up to 3½ minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, on this Richardson amendment, it's interesting because I always like amendments that are trying to do something technical. But where I'm finding actually sort of a problem in the flow of logic is—think about this: We have a neighborhood stabilization program down to its last billion dollars, we've already spent what, 6 billion? And the concept written in this amendment is saying that, well, it's going to keep acquiring one, two, three to four units, fourplexes, properties, and it's going to keep acquiring them until a certain number of mortgages are—only this percentage are underwater, or the mortgage value is greater than the value of the house. Does that seem like I'm going in the right direction?

Ms. RICHARDSON. Fairly.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. But here's the classic problem in the design of that. If the Neighborhood Stabilization Act

does what I think it does, it's either a municipality, a nonprofit, this and that, buying a property, sometimes rehabbing it, sometimes removing the boarded-up windows, sometimes just buying a property and competing with the private investors and the first-time home buyers in that neighborhood and then turning around and putting it back on the market.

Well, if one of our problems out there is we have a glut of properties on the market, and that's one of the things holding down our values, and I'm going to continue to support a program that's going to drop another billion dollars buying properties and then putting them back on the market. We have a circular logic here where I can't imagine the mechanics within this, well meaning as they may be, actually have any basis in economics or particularly real estate economics.

□ 1640

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The other point that is significant and that needs to be dealt with here is the \$6 billion that has already been given away. That money continues to recycle with those groups. It should. As to the cities, the counties, the nonprofits, when they buy a house, refurbish it and sell it and when the money comes back at whatever level, they could take that money and buy another piece of property.

Nothing in my bill does anything with the \$6 billion that's out there. It just says: We're not going to give you another \$1 billion. We're going to try to give that back to the taxpayers.

If we could get the \$6 billion back and could find a way to do it, I believe we'd be trying to attack that vein, too, but that will not occur and cannot occur as the money has already been given away. They're going to continue to recycle it, hopefully to some benefit—hopefully somebody will benefit from this—but it's \$6 billion given away. My colleague was exactly correct in his statements. As for the \$1 billion that we have not given away, we're saying it is time to stop giving away taxpayer dollars.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my remaining time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Just to summarize again what my amendment is talking about, it is the ability of State and local governments to revitalize, to rehab and to help the neighborhoods so that those property values can go up and so we can improve the economy. I would venture to say it's not giving away the money. It's actually helping to revitalize and stimulate our economy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 112-34.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. NOTIFICATION TO NSP GRANTEES REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall inform each covered entity (as such term is defined in subsection (b)) in writing—

(1) that the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has been terminated;

(2) of the name and contact information of such entity's Member of Congress that represents its district; and

(3) that such entity should contact such Member of Congress directly for assistance in mitigating foreclosed properties.

(b) COVERED ENTITY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "covered entity" means any nonprofit, government, or other organization that—

(1) received or was scheduled to receive funding pursuant to section 2301 of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-289; 122 Stat. 2850) or title XII of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5; 123 Stat. 218) through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program; and

(2) as a result of the rescission of funding under section 2 and termination of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program under section 3, will have funding for the entity made available under the provision of law specified in section 2 rescinded and canceled.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 170, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, my amendment would simply require the

Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to send a notice to all of the NSP grantees who would have received funding under the third round of NSP that the program has been terminated. Further, the notice would include the name and contact information for the Member of Congress representing that grantee's district, along with a notice saying that the grantee can contact that Member directly for assistance in mitigating foreclosed properties.

As you know, we passed such an amendment off the floor when we took up the FHA bill, which would have basically allowed the homeowners to refinance their properties. So we have one such amendment with the elimination of that program.

The CBO has scored this amendment at zero cost. Since the passage of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010, which provided the NSP funds that are now subject to this repeal, my office has received many calls from potential grantees about the status of the program and what funding they could expect.

Because this act would rescind those funds nearly 8 months after the passage of Dodd-Frank, I think that a simple letter from HUD, sent to States, counties and cities, which would simply notify them of this change, is in order. Moreover, a note to these States, counties and cities saying that their Members of Congress are available to assist them in mitigating foreclosed properties can help these grantees find alternative solutions.

I've discovered there are any number of Members starting to do this kind of thing. They are getting calls from their constituents who are asking for help with loan modifications, and the Members are able to, not get involved with the particular problem, but to help guide them and send them to the proper servicers to get their loan modifications. This is similar to that. Simply, our office has been able to say: Yes, the program is no longer in existence, but this is what you can do if there is an alternative.

Now, I would prefer not to rehash the back-and-forth we saw in the Financial Services Committee about the termination of this program. Members on my side of the aisle showed pictures, talked about the problems caused by abandoned properties, and even showed letters from their districts, letters which talked about the good work NSP was doing. Yet the debate, it seems, will not sway my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Instead, I think it's best to focus on my amendment.

I believe this is a commonsense provision that can be accepted by both sides of the aisle regardless of whether they agree with the underlying bill. Grantees should be made aware of this funding rescission, and Members of Congress should stand ready to help communities mitigate the effects of blighted properties.

I would ask for the support of my colleagues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Chair, the Congresswoman's amendment does nothing to help at-risk borrowers, and the notification the Congresswoman proposes would apply only to community groups, leaders and speculators currently participating in the program. It is not a serious attempt to address the underlying problem homeowners are facing today.

If we are going to have a notification requirement, it makes more sense to have the recipients of these funds to date notify taxpayers how much, in what way they have spent taxpayer dollars and what return taxpayers can expect from their investments.

Unfortunately, the answer is: none. Many have questioned HUD's ability to properly monitor the use of such extraordinary amounts of money being spent at the State level and in various ways. The Inspector General of HUD has already identified multiple misuses of NSP money at the State level. The GAO has questioned the information system in place at HUD, and has questioned its ability to track the NSP funds.

I wish the amendment had said: Please continue using the \$6 billion in an appropriate way, and in some way, do everything you can to create jobs for the American workers with the \$6 billion we've given you.

It does not say that, and I cannot support the amendment the way it is drafted.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I have heard so many convoluted arguments today about this legislation from the opposite side of the aisle.

My colleague from California, my friend and someone I highly respect, knows that he does not have to wish what an amendment would say. If he is interested in an amendment, he can offer it. My colleague from California did not offer the amendment that he has just alluded to, and he did not suggest when we were in committee that somehow he would like to have an alternative. So I find it rather curious that he would come to the floor and start wishing what my amendment would say.

Secondly, I want to straighten out something. My colleague from California keeps talking about how this bill does not stop any foreclosures. The NSP legislation was not intended to stop foreclosures. It was intended to do exactly what the name implies, which is to stabilize communities by taking these boarded up and abandoned properties, rehabbing them or tearing them down so that they discontinue the devaluing of the properties of those homeowners who are trying to keep

their properties up and stay in the community.

□ 1650

If he, in fact, was concerned about helping homeowners, he would have supported the FHA refi programs. That program, he voted against. The FHA refi program was basically a program for middle class people who paid their bills on time, but who simply knew that their homes were underwater. They were not worth what they thought they should be worth when they got into the market, and they want to refinance them. He voted against that.

So I am not so sure, when he talks about this NSP program not helping anybody stay in their homes, whether or not he really, really wants to help people stay in their homes when he is voting against something like the FHA refi.

As for jobs, this bill creates jobs; and I think my colleague knows that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, I did not introduce an amendment because I introduced the bill. I think that bill speaks for itself.

But I am glad that my good friend admitted that this was not meant to mitigate the foreclosure process for people going through. I am glad you admitted that, because that is not what your amendment says. It says that: such entities should contact such Members of Congress directly for assistance in mitigating foreclosed properties. You can't mitigate a foreclosure when you don't help anybody with the foreclosure.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chair, first, this is one of those few moments I get to stand behind the microphone; and I say, having met the good woman from California, she has actually been very gentle to me as a freshman, so far.

But one of my concerns here is very, very simple: there is \$6 billion out there. And I won't call it a slush fund. Back in my days as Maricopa County Treasurer, we would call it a revolving fund. There is \$6 billion out there already that goes out, and if the property is sold, comes back; and that I believe operates for 5 years from the enactment of the bill.

Well, a letter like this goes out and says, Oh, well, the last \$1 billion isn't going to be there for you, but please keep using the \$6 billion you already have to go do more good works in the neighborhood.

My great fear is something like this doesn't really accomplish much good.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield myself the balance of my time.

As much as I respect my good friend—and she knows—we have worked together on a lot of issues, and I don't believe anything between us has ever been personal in all the years we

have known each other. And nothing in this debate is personal. We both want to help the American people. And I say that from the heart, and you know that. And I know your efforts are for the right purposes. But good people can disagree in a good way. And on this amendment, I have to respectfully disagree, and I would ask for a “no” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 112-34.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. STUDY ON IMPACTS REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall conduct a study to determine the approximate number of foreclosed and abandoned properties that will not be purchased or rehabilitated with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under section 2301 of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-289; 122 Stat. 2850; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note) in the district of each Member of Congress as a result of the rescission and termination of funding under sections 2 and 3 of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the results of the study under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 170, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment would direct the Secretary of HUD to conduct a study to determine the approximate number of foreclosed and abandoned properties that will not be purchased or rehabilitated in the district of each Member of Congress as a result of the rescission and termination of funding under this act. The Secretary would then report these findings to Congress. CBO has scored this amendment at zero cost.

Now, personally, I do not believe that the Neighborhood Stabilization Program should be terminated because

NSP creates jobs. So far, about 72,000 housing units are projected to be impacted by round one of NSP. HUD projects that an additional 24,000 housing units are projected to be impacted by NSP2.

Each of these projects requires the work of contractors, such as roofers and painters and landscapers and pavers. And through the program, other real estate professionals like Realtors and title insurance agents have also received employment and contracting opportunities. This NSP program really does create jobs, and this is a program that creates jobs by doing important work in the community.

Contrary to what some say, the problem of homes abandoned by banks is common, and it is difficult for municipalities to mitigate their effects. As GAO has noted in a report from November 2010, servicers sometimes charge off properties or fail to formally foreclose on borrowers because the costs of maintaining the property post-foreclosure exceed the costs of just writing the property off. These charge-offs typically occur after the foreclosure proceedings were initiated. However, borrowers aren't aware that the servicers are stopping short of taking their title.

Because borrowers think that their servicer has finalized the foreclosure process, they may move away and become unreachable by the municipal agency now dealing with the upkeep of the property.

Additionally, it may become logistically difficult or cost prohibitive to track down thousands of borrowers now responsible for property maintenance, taxes, and code violations because of servicers' failure to formally foreclose.

Additionally, NSP provides an alternative to speculative investors purchasing foreclosed properties. Unlike homeowners and municipalities, some speculative investors often purchase properties for cash and in bulk, sometimes sight unseen, buying them up before others have a chance to bid. Some of these investors may not resell properties to owner-occupants, but let them sit on the market without any improvements while the investor waits for housing prices to rebound.

Alternatively, anecdotal evidence suggests that investor-owners sometimes rent properties out to tenants with little or no rehabilitation or maintenance of the property.

We had a field hearing in Minneapolis in January 2010. At that field hearing, State Senator Linda Higgins said, “Homes are being snapped up by investors. Some are clueless about how to rehabilitate a building and get good tenants. Others think that the laws really aren't meant for them. They buy a house for pennies, paint the wall, scrub the kitchen appliances, and rent it out. They forget the small details like the condemnation order and the requirements for lifting the condemnation and getting a new certificate of

occupancy and the need for a rental license."

That is not to say that all private investment is bad, but we must recognize that the work NSP is doing is a critical counterweight to some of these bad practices. For all of these reasons, I will defend the work that NSP is doing across the country. However, we are here now because we need to talk about this amendment and what it would do once this program is terminated.

My NSP study amendment would provide critical information to Members of Congress. If Members knew the number of abandoned and foreclosed properties in their district that will not be mitigated because of this rescission of funds, they would be better prepared to help grantees access responsible private market sources of funds that can help community revitalization. I would ask my colleagues' support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend has said that we need to determine the approximate number of foreclosed and abandoned properties that will be purchased or rehabilitated because of termination of NSP. That is impossible. We have no idea how many times the money will be recycled, because the \$6 billion that is out there could be recycled over and over and over. We don't know. We don't know how much money is going to be given away to somebody who bought the house, how much is going to be taken back in the sale. So that is an unknown quantity.

But my good friend did say that 72,000 units were impacted by NSP 1. So, America, for \$6 billion you impacted 72,000 units. How do you feel about that? Now, I am not sure what we did to impact them, but we impacted them. We sure spent a lot of your money impacting them.

Now, at the same time, we are asking HUD to do a study. That is like the fox guarding the hen house. I am really sorry. Because when I asked Mercedes Marquez of HUD at our committee hearing to discuss where the money went, she finally said, The money is going to homeowners and to American citizens. And they strongly support the program and they are strongly encouraging the President to veto this bill, should it get to him.

So let's just have the very organization do a study on a program that they said they support and love and, if we are successful in getting the bill passed, would encourage the administration to veto it.

That is the biggest conflict of interest I have ever had presented to me to vote on, but it is an easy conflict of interest that I say is a conflict of inter-

est. I would strongly encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. MALONEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 112-34.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk which is in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:
SEC. 5. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds have the potential to rehabilitate housing units in all 50 states:

(A) There are 13369 homes in Alabama that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(B) There are 974 homes in Arkansas that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(C) There are 52511 homes in Arizona that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(D) There are 92186 homes in California that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(E) There are 20671 homes in Colorado that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(F) There are 8501 homes in Connecticut that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(G) There are 224 homes in the District of Columbia that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(H) There are 549 homes in Delaware that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(I) There are 203882 homes in Florida that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(J) There are 92950 homes in Georgia that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(K) There are 754 homes in Hawaii that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(L) There are 2609 homes in Iowa that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eli-

gible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(M) There are 375 homes in Idaho that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(N) There are 49043 homes in Illinois that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(O) There are 74100 homes in Indiana that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(P) There are 2311 homes in Kansas that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(Q) There are 1191 homes in Kentucky that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(R) There are 2439 homes in Louisiana that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(S) There are 7331 homes in Massachusetts that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(T) There are 1878 homes in Maryland that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(U) There are 167 homes in Maine that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(V) There are 120365 homes in Michigan that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(W) There are 13937 homes in Minnesota that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(X) There are 20084 homes in Missouri that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(Y) There are 4431 homes in Mississippi that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(Z) There are 172 homes in Montana that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(AA) There are 4510 homes in North Carolina that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(BB) There are 7 homes in North Dakota that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(CC) There are 2911 homes in Nebraska that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(DD) There are 155 homes in New Hampshire that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(EE) There are 10859 homes in New Jersey that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(FF) There are 41297 homes in Nevada that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(GG) There are 16422 homes in New York that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(HH) There are 116325 homes in Ohio that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(II) There are 2961 homes in Oklahoma that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(JJ) There are 32 homes in Oregon that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(KK) There are 847 homes in Pennsylvania that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(LL) There are 3142 homes in Rhode Island that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(MM) There are 11172 homes in South Carolina that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(NN) There are 18141 homes in Tennessee that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(OO) There are 33982 homes in Texas that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(PP) There are 85 homes in Utah that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(QQ) There are 5638 homes in Virginia that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(RR) There are 71 homes in Washington that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(SS) There are 5413 homes in Wisconsin that have been vacant 90 or more days and could be eligible to receive funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

(2) Congress finds that by voting to terminate the Neighborhood Stabilization Program these housing units may not be able to be rehabilitated and may remain vacant.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 170, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act which will quantify the number of vacant homes across the country and add findings to the bill listing these numbers in every State so that it will be transparent exactly what the impact will be in not continuing this program that is needed.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program is one of four programs that my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to eliminate. All of these programs in one way or another help to stabilize neighborhoods and help to provide affordable housing to keep people in their homes.

Economists have testified before our committee and other committees that housing is as much as 25 percent of our economy, so it is critical that we do what we can to stabilize housing, not just for the benefit of the families ben-

efiting from the housing, but also for their neighbors, for their localities, for their cities, for their States and for the overall economy.

Foreclosed properties lead to volatile housing prices, blight and the deterioration of communities. The mayor of New York cited at a recent meeting of the delegation how important the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has been to help New York recover from the housing crisis. He said that over 500 units were rehabbed and converted into affordable rental housing through the three rounds of funding that have come forward.

Now, some of my colleagues say this is not important or should not be a priority, but I can tell you it has been a lifesaving program, particularly to the families that are living there now and to their neighbors and to the housing prices and the neighbors where these housing units are located.

Funding has also been used to assist multifamily buildings in distress and has provided long-term affordability for renters. It also has provided jobs. The two main priorities of most communities across this country are housing and jobs, and this program helps provide both.

My amendment points out why the program is so desperately needed by listing, through findings, the number of vacant homes that could be eligible for funding by State. For example, in the home State of my good friend and colleague Mr. MILLER, California, there are over 92,000 homes that have been vacant for 90 or more days. In my State of New York, there are over 16,000 homes that have been vacant for over 90 days.

The amendment clarifies that by terminating the program, vacant homes across the country cannot benefit from the Neighborhood Stabilization funds that could help acquire, demolish in some cases, rehab in some cases and redevelop in other cases.

We have all seen the pictures on television of bulldozers plowing vacant homes under because they are pulling down the prices and are a blight in neighborhoods. This is one program that I have received phone calls on, not just from the mayor in the city in which I serve, but in cities across this country, where they have expressed the importance of the program in helping them to stabilize and to recover from this financial crisis caused primarily from the subprime mortgages.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program accomplishes the dual goals of incentivizing homeownership while also improving the housing stock in neighborhoods devastated by foreclosures. Vacant, foreclosed properties have a very negative effect on the surrounding neighborhoods and on the property values of homes in those neighborhoods.

I believe this is an important amendment to highlight the potential housing stock in this country that Neighborhood Stabilization funds could be

used to help, to rehab, to redevelop, to resell, to preserve neighborhood property values in communities across our great country; so I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, I know my good friend Mrs. MALONEY has the best of intentions in putting this amendment forward, but you are talking about the number of homes in each State that have been vacant 90 days or more and could ultimately receive funding under the NSP.

Well, the homes are not eligible to receive funding. Entities are eligible to receive funding. Then those entities, whether they be government or private sector, can go buy those homes. The problem is they can buy any home they want to. The only restriction on the program is that you can only earn up to 120 percent of the median income in an area to qualify to buy the house, but it does not restrict the price of the home being bought by the agency or the nonprofit. They can buy virtually any home they want to, and that is one of the flaws in the bill.

For example, if you have any home that has been vacant 90 days or more, well, I have a partner of mine and myself, we had four homes for sale in the last year that were on the market more than 90 days. The houses were in perfect condition, but yet they remained on the market for over 90 days. So based on this encouragement, one of these groups, whether it be a city, a county, a private entity that is not affiliated with government, could have bought those houses and resold the houses for far less than they paid for them. That is the flaw with this program here.

We are saying that what this wants us to do here is congressional findings to the bill listing all 50 States and the District of Columbia in separate subparagraphs and the number of homes in each State that have been vacant 90 days or more and could be eligible to receive funding in NSP.

What you mean is any home vacant for over 90 days would have to be listed, because there is not a dollar amount in the bill saying how much you can pay for a house. There is only a dollar amount saying how much a person can earn to buy the house.

For example, if you live in Hawaii, you can make up to \$73,825.20 a year and qualify to buy a home. In California, you can earn \$68,416.80 a year and qualify to buy a home. It might be an \$800,000 home, but you can still qualify, if they sell it to you cheap enough. In Virginia, you could earn \$74,382 and buy a home; in New Jersey, \$78,367; in Massachusetts, \$72,384; in

Utah, \$75,044; in Alaska, \$76,786; in Colorado, \$73,131; and in New Hampshire, \$79,411.

So the concept of this program is just helping people at the lower rungs who are really struggling. I am not saying people aren't struggling in these income brackets. That is not what I mean. But I don't want the American people to have the perception we are just trying to pick up deals and sell them to the lowest of income levels.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman is listing those numbers. Would the gentleman tell us what the maximum number is he thinks people should be eligible to get a house through the FHA and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Reclaiming my time, I was in the building industry from my early twenties, and the most excitement you could ever see on a person's face was when they bought a home and they were moving into that home and they thought about raising their family.

I would love a country that every person in this country has the ability and the opportunity at some point in their life to buy a home. But, in some fashion, lenders have put people in positions to put them in homes that they could not afford, and those homes, in many cases the individuals lost those homes through foreclosures. And those people, who were well-intentioned, moved into homes that they could not afford because the lender perhaps did not describe it exactly or they thought the way the economy is going, in 3 or 4 or 5 years the house is going to be worth 40 percent more than I paid and I am going to make a lot of money. The problem is the market went the other way, as it did in 1974–1975, 1981–1983, 1990–1996, and recently in 2007 to current the market slid.

□ 1710

And then we're saying we're going to go out and we're going to ask to do a survey and we're going to list any home throughout the United States in separate paragraphs that have been vacant for 90 days or more that could be eligible. Well, all of them would be eligible.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. From my recollection, I was struck by the gentleman talking about those figures, that they were too high, because the last I heard, the gentleman and I were together in trying to establish—

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Reclaiming my time, Mr. FRANK, what specifically has been said throughout this debate, as if we're trying to help people at the lower rungs, which I have

no problem with, but I'm saying that there was not a restriction on the amount that could be paid for the house and there was not a requirement of how much it should be sold for.

I ask for a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. MALONEY. The problem is the other side of the aisle wants to abolish four programs that help people stay in their homes, helps affordable housing. They have no idea or no program to be helpful. They say it will be taxpayers' money. But if they supported the Democratic plan, it would have come out of an assessment on the banks.

I understand the chairman will be introducing a bill, and I would like to co-sponsor that.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I just would say that the gentleman from California previously had agreed with some of us that you could be able to get a house in the FHA for up to \$729,000.

Mrs. MALONEY. Reclaiming my time, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 861—NSP TERMINATION ACT

(Rep. Miller, R-CA, and 4 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 861, which would eliminate the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) and rescind \$1 billion of funding from the program's current efforts. This program allows States and select local governments to stabilize neighborhoods by redeveloping foreclosed and abandoned properties, leading to increased property values and lowered risk of foreclosure from remaining residents. The Administration is committed to helping struggling American homeowners stay in their homes, and has taken many steps over the last two years to stabilize what was a rapidly-declining housing market. With many communities still struggling with the impact of the severe decline in the housing market, the Administration believes that continued funding of the NSP grants is important to the Nation's sustained economic recovery.

If the President is presented with H.R. 861, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
March 7, 2011.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman, Financial Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BACHUS: I am writing to express my strong opposition to H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) Termination Act. NSP has helped cities across the country address and mitigate the deleterious effects that vacant and blighted properties have on neighborhoods and property values. As a result of the foreclosure crisis, communities throughout the country, including Los Angeles, face significant challenges as foreclosed homes create a vicious cycle of blight, neighborhood decay, and lower property values. NSP has been instru-

mental in helping to stem this downward spiral by addressing the negative effects of abandoned and foreclosed properties.

In the City of Los Angeles, where, over the past four years, we have an estimated 39,000 foreclosed properties, NSP has played a critical role stabilizing our fragile housing market and helping to construct and rehabilitate a total of 1,200 housing units. Furthermore, at a time when unemployment in our construction industry is at an all-time high, NSP has created more than 900 jobs spurring Los Angeles' economic recovery.

Given the economic challenges facing cities today, I urge the committee to continue funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Very truly yours,

ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY OF CHICAGO,
March 8, 2011.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER FRANK: I understand that the Financial Services committee is marking up two bills on Wednesday, March 9, and marked up two more last week. I am concerned that these bills would eliminate four important programs that help both homeowners facing foreclosure and localities facing increasing numbers of vacant and abandoned properties. I am especially concerned with the NSP Termination Act, which would terminate the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and eliminate a third round of funding, known as NSP 3, created under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform bill.

Localities, like Chicago, are in desperate need of funding such as NSP 3 to assist neighborhoods that are facing unprecedented numbers of foreclosures. In 2010, for example, there were 23,364 foreclosure filings in Chicago. To put this in perspective, before the housing crisis began in 2007, Chicago saw an average of 8,375 foreclosure filings per year.

As you are aware, foreclosures are devastating for neighborhoods—vacant and abandoned properties depress home values, weaken the tax base, breed crime, and drive up government costs as municipalities bear the burden of securing and maintaining them. Cities are already stretched thin financially and need as much support as possible from the federal government.

We have already used funds from previous NSP programs to revitalize neighborhoods and create jobs. To date, the City of Chicago has committed funds from the first two rounds of NSP to assist 579 units in 120 properties in targeted hard-hit areas, representing more than \$75 million in NSP investment. In addition, our NSP work thus far has created 344 construction jobs.

Using the \$15.9 million the City of Chicago expects to receive in NSP 3 funds, we estimate we can acquire and rehabilitate approximately 70 vacant units and demolish approximately 100 vacant, blighted units. These funds will allow us to continue the work we have started in communities across Chicago that have been hardest hit by foreclosure. Every vacant property that is rehabbed moves us closer to stabilizing these neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

RICHARD M. DALEY,
Mayor.

MARCH 1, 2011.

Re Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. LUIS GUTIERREZ,
Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRPERSON BIGGERT AND RANKING MEMBER GUTIERREZ: The undersigned organizations representing local elected officials, State and local program practitioners, and community-based organizations write in support of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program—NSP1, NSP2, and NSP3. The collapse of the housing market in 2008 wreaked havoc on neighborhoods across America; foreclosures were rampant and abandoned homes dotted both urban and rural landscapes. This national crisis threatened to bring down local economies. Congress stepped in to provide funding for NSP1—the first round of funding under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program—to abate the crisis. This funding was quickly followed by NSP2 and NSP3 to further aid local neighborhoods. While more funding is needed, the contribution these programs have made have been important to abating the foreclosure crisis and arresting neighborhood decline. NSP3 is needed to continue the reverberating effect of the activities started under NSP1 and NSP2.

According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), NSP1 and NSP2, combined, have assisted approximately 100,000 properties. The programs have assisted a wide mix of income levels, from very-low income persons at or below 50% of area median income to middle-income people with incomes up to 120% of area median income.

NSP funds are efficiently allocated and managed. NSP funds are highly targeted to communities with the most severe neighborhood problems associated with the foreclosure crisis. Grantees are under very tight deadlines to obligate and expend the funds, ensuring that funds are spent quickly. The programs have strict reporting requirements that allows HUD to see that the funds are being spent as directed by statute and regulation and in a timely fashion.

The programs could not have been implemented in such an efficient and quick manner without the guidance and technical assistance that has been provided by HUD. HUD staff have devoted a lot of time and resources to NSP grantees to ensure they have the capacity and tools to allocate funds quickly and implement program activities to arrest neighborhood decline.

We urge you and the other Subcommittee members to support these valuable neighborhood revitalization programs.

Sincerely,

National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Community Development Association, National Association for County Community and Economic Development, Council of State Community Development Agencies, Enterprise Community Partners, Inc.

NYC DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
 PRESERVATION & DEVELOPMENT,

New York, NY, March 9, 2011.

Re H.R. 839—"The HAMP Termination Act of 2011"; H.R. 861—"NSP Termination Act".

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman,

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Ranking Member, Financial Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: I am writing this letter to express the City of New York's op-

position to the above-referenced bills coming before the House Financial Services Committee. These measures would eliminate crucial foreclosure prevention and neighborhood stabilization support available to homeowners and communities grappling with the devastating effects of the foreclosure crisis here in New York City.

The Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP) has been an invaluable tool for homeowners throughout the city who have unsustainable mortgages.

Data shows us that permanent HAMP modifications have on average saved homeowners almost \$400 more in monthly payments than the savings achieved by non-HAMP modifications (\$1200 vs. \$828).

Of the permanent modifications reported by the Center for New York City Neighborhood's extensive network of service providers, 46% are HAMP modifications (479 out of 1036), which is on par with the national average of 41%, as reported by the OCC (<http://tinyurl.com/4qajkkt>).

HAMP has had a tremendous impact in New York. In the NYC MSA, there have been 41,785 HAMP modifications (32,785 permanent and 9,000 active trials), which represents 6% of all HAMP activity nationwide.

Without HAMP foreclosure prevention efforts would be greatly diminished. HAMP has been critically important in moving the mortgage industry to make more affordable, sustainable modifications for homeowners who have the ability to stay in their homes. We know from counselors on the ground that the banks' own proprietary modifications have become more affordable and "HAMP-like" since the full roll-out of the program, further illustrating HAMP's impact. However, HAMP must be preserved because even as the quality of non-HAMP modifications improves, they are not nearly as beneficial as HAMP modifications.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) provides states and municipalities with much-needed funds to stabilize neighborhoods hardest-hit by the foreclosure crisis. In NYC, we have used NSP funds to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed homes for resale as affordable housing.

NSP funds are reducing the city's stock of vacant, foreclosed homes that are a blight on communities. To date, we have acquired 65 homes that are in various stages of rehab, and on track to buy and restore 25 more. We are poised to launch a program that will offer NSP funds as downpayment assistance to encourage homeowners to buy foreclosed homes. These programs accomplish dual goals of incentivizing homeownership while also improving the housing stock in neighborhoods devastated by foreclosure.

NSP funding has also been used to assist multifamily rental buildings in distress, providing long-term affordability for income-eligible families. As a result of the economic downturn, New York City is witnessing an increase in the number of rental buildings with deteriorating physical conditions, with many of these buildings in default on their mortgages. Addressing the needs of these properties is putting a strain on our typical funding sources, making NSP a particularly valuable tool. We have expended over \$3M of NSP funds on the acquisition of foreclosed multi-family buildings, creating over 200 affordable rental units in The Bronx and Brooklyn. At least \$10 million in future NSP funds will be targeted towards stabilizing some of the most distressed multi-family rental housing in the City.

As outlined here, the aforementioned programs offer critical assistance to New York City families and neighborhoods suffering from the harmful effects of the foreclosure crisis. These programs' positive impacts are extensive and they are compelling. To elimi-

nate them now would be unwise. For these reasons, The City of New York oppose their termination.

Sincerely,

RAFAEL E. CESTERO,
Commissioner.

REPORT ON THE NUMBER OF HOMES VACANT 90 DAYS OR MORE

State	Number of Homes Vacant 90 Days or More
Alabama	13,369
Arkansas	974
Arizona	52,511
California	92,186
Colorado	20,671
Connecticut	8,501
Washington, DC	224
Delaware	549
Florida	203,882
Georgia	92,950
Hawaii	754
Iowa	2,609
Idaho	375
Illinois	49,043
Indiana	74,100
Kansas	2,311
Kentucky	1,191
Louisiana	2,439
Massachusetts	7,331
Maryland	1,878
Maine	167
Michigan	120,365
Minnesota	13,937
Missouri	20,084
Mississippi	4,431
Montana	172
North Carolina	4,510
North Dakota	7
Nebraska	2,911
New Hampshire	155
New Jersey	10,859
New Mexico	0
Nevada	41,297
New York	16,422
Ohio	116,325
Oklahoma	2,961
Oregon	32
Pennsylvania	847
Puerto Rico	0
Rhode Island	3,142
South Carolina	11,172
Tennessee	18,141
Texas	33,982
Utah	85
Virginia	5,638
Vermont	0
Washington	71
Wisconsin	5,413
Wyoming	0

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

EN BLOC AMENDMENTS NO. 9 AND 10 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider en bloc amendments No. 9 and 10 printed in part B of House Report 112-34.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I have en bloc amendments at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the en bloc amendments.

The text of the en bloc amendments is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 9

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. GAO STUDY OF ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF ROUND 3 NSP FUNDING.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the economic impacts that providing assistance under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, using the funding identified in section 2, would have on States and communities in the United States, if such funding were not rescinded and canceled under such section, but remained available and was used in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such amounts as in effect immediately before the repeal under section 3(a). Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the results and conclusions of the study under this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. GAO STUDY OF ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF ROUNDS 1 AND 2 NSP FUNDING.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the economic impacts that providing assistance under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has had on States and communities in the United States. The study shall identify such impacts resulting from the funding under the each of the provisions of law specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 3(b)(2). Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the results and conclusions of the study under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 170, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, my amendments are very simple. They say that 90 days after enactment of this bill, we will commence a Government Accountability study to determine the impact of Neighborhood Stabilization rounds 1, 2, and 3 on communities all across the country.

Now, I have to tell you, Madam Chair, I do not need a study to tell me that in my community Neighborhood Stabilization has provided terrific benefits. Neighborhood Stabilization in the Tampa Bay area in Florida, a community that was very hard hit by predatory lending, subprime mortgage, and the foreclosure crisis, Neighborhood Stabilization has given us the tools to create vital housing in the midst of this horrendous crisis and it has created jobs.

Things have been tough in my neck of the woods, and Neighborhood Stabilization has given communities in our neighborhoods and our nonprofit agencies a little bit of hope. Property values in the Tampa Bay area have plummeted by over 40 percent since 2007. Neighborhood Stabilization has helped us to stop the bleeding. Neighborhood Stabilization has helped us protect our property values. And

Neighborhood Stabilization has turned some of the worst abandoned and foreclosed homes that were causing blight all across our community into rehabilitated properties. And here are just a few examples of what Neighborhood Stabilization has done in Tampa and in Hillsborough County.

First, with the help of our local nonprofit partners, in East Tampa we have taken an abandoned, dilapidated residential property and we are turning it into housing for 18 homeless female veterans and their families. If you come down to my neck of the woods, unfortunately, you will see folks out on the street corner. We have a panhandling problem like never before—nothing I have ever seen in my lifetime in my hometown—and it's very difficult to deal with. A lot of the homeless are veterans, and some of them are female veterans. So we've taken that Neighborhood Stabilization money and plugged it into buying an old abandoned residential property, and we're now providing housing for those homeless veterans. We broke ground last fall, and all of the construction workers, the architects, the engineers, they were there to thank us because they also needed the work.

Here's a second example. We also breathed new life into a new downtown redevelopment mixed use initiative. Years ago, the Tampa community tore down what was the worst public housing project anywhere around. It was named Central Park Village. Well, thanks to Neighborhood Stabilization, next week we are going to break ground on the first residential piece of this new community. The first residential piece will provide affordable apartments to seniors. Neighborhood Stabilization did that. We did not have the funds and our local partners did not have the funds to continue on that mixed use public-private partnership. And it gets even better, because that big mixed use project is going to create 4,000 construction jobs in an area that really needs them and 1,000 permanent jobs once the new redevelopment is finished.

Third, through our community, we have targeted those ugly, abandoned, dilapidated houses and duplexes on the street or boarded-up apartment complexes. We put people to work cleaning them up. We've sold them or rented to a family that met eligibility standards. A renovated home can sometimes set off a chain reaction of home improvement throughout your neighborhood, and that is what we're seeing.

The alternative would be letting houses stay vacant, continuing to drag down property values in my community even further. We're putting families back into these homes. Our local nonprofit partners are returning them to the fabric of the neighborhoods rather than just having them sit there or seeing them flipped by out-of-town investors.

In addition to the meaningful tools Neighborhood Stabilization gives to

local communities like mine and the thousands of jobs it has helped create, I would like you to take one step back and consider the modest investment Neighborhood Stabilization has provided—overall, \$7 billion over the past few years. I can't help but compare that to the \$700 billion that was provided to Wall Street through the Wall Street bailout that I did not support because that was not directing the big banks to provide any help to our local communities. Well, Neighborhood Stabilization, this very modest investment—1 percent of the Wall Street bailout funds—now is providing greater stabilization throughout our communities.

So I urge my colleagues to support my amendments and oppose H.R. 861.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Some of the arguments that the gentle lady made are heart-wrenching. You hate to think about homeless people. Veterans are suffering in this country, there's no doubt about it. Veterans are coming back. Some of them have problems from being on the front in combat. In our church every week, our pastor talks about that, and we pray for these veterans. You feel sorry for them.

But we talk about elderly; we talk about veterans; we talk about children; we talk about homeless. Nothing in this bill prioritizes them in any fashion. There are groups that could be helped as a consequence of it, and I understand that, but nothing prioritizes.

I'm going to accept the gentle lady's amendment because I have no problem with trying to determine the economic impact of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. I think there's been a huge impact on the economy because we've given away, to date, \$6 billion of taxpayers' money on this program. And I think we could have done a much better job at investing that money in another fashion that wouldn't have put the taxpayers at risk and perhaps created jobs in doing that.

But I met with the NAHB, National Association of Home Builders, to talk about all the people in the industry out of work. I've talked to BIA, talking about all the Building Industry Association members out of work, and they're trying to put them to work. This bill does not help them.

We talk about a giveaway to banks. In TARP 1, we lent money to banks, yes, and they paid it back with interest. Freddie and Fannie, yes, we're lending money to Freddie and Fannie. They're paying 10 percent interest on the money. So to create this straw man out there of the bank giveaway and Wall Street and Freddie and Fannie is fallacious. Freddie and Fannie are paying 10 percent interest on the money.

We did not just, the people who voted for the first half of TARP, vote to give

banks money and forget it, go home. It was to stop a major run on the banks and to stop this economy from plummeting. And Bernanke and Paulson and the administration, everybody on both sides of the aisle agreed it had to be done. And the money was paid back, and we made money on it. Shock.

This money was given away and we will not be getting it back.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

□ 1720

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chairman, I am pleased that we're actually accepting this amendment, because if we get an honest study from it, it could be some very interesting numbers. But I hope it's an honest study that also looks from top to bottom. Such as in the Neighborhood Stabilization Program in the previous \$6 billion that has been spent, what crowding out has it done? What first-time homebuyers, what investors, found themselves competing with government? It would be interesting to know.

Also, we keep hearing the numbers of saying, well, with our government money we created this many jobs. How many jobs were being created if they were private investors or first-time homebuyers or other families that were acquiring the same sort of properties and fixing them up? If we're going to get like for like, it will be fascinating.

Then we also have to deal with the reality of it as we saw in the previous amendment. In that amendment, it was claiming there were about 1,061,000, we'll call them vacant units in the country. Okay. If we start doing the math with the remaining billion dollars of additional money, how much impact does that have? And will the study also step up and say, with the \$6 billion that's out there that's supposed to be acting like a revolving fund, 5 years from the beginning of this program, which was what, last summer? How is that money being used? How much velocity is it really getting? Or is it now sitting in houses that are competing with other neighbors who are trying to sell theirs.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman. I was not meaning to be rude or forget about you.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague very much for agreeing to accept my amendments.

My point on comparing neighborhood stabilization to the Wall Street bailout was just to point out—and I know both sides of the aisle were involved in the Wall Street bailout. It was the Bush administration, but a number of Democrats worked to do that, and I'm not here to criticize that. It's just to compare the scale. There was \$700 billion provided to Wall Street banks, just to compare, and 1 percent of that to communities under neighborhood stabilization.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I reclaim my time.

I was going to allow for adequate time on that, but it was not a give-away. It was a loan. You're comparing \$350 billion in the first half that was lent to lenders to stabilize the economy versus \$700 billion that was a give-away.

It's my time, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Regular order, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts will allow the gentleman from California to continue.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I think we're comparing things that have nothing to do with the bill before us. So we can talk about Wall Street. We can talk about banks. If anything, this has helped banks because it's taken foreclosed properties that they've had and it's bought them. So we can add all these straw men to the debate that we want to. The thing is, should we give away taxpayer dollars? I say no and I ask for an "aye" on the gentlelady's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 112-34 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. WATERS of California.

Amendment No. 7 by Ms. WATERS of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 244, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

AYES—183

Ackerman	Garamendi	Owens
Andrews	Gonzalez	Pallone
Baca	Green, Al	Pascrell
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Barrow	Grijalva	Payne
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Becerra	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Berman	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Polis
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hinchev	Quigley
Boren	Hinojosa	Rahall
Boswell	Hirono	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Holt	Reyes
Braley (IA)	Honda	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Richmond
Butterfield	Inslee	Ross (AR)
Capps	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	(TX)	Rush
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	T.
Chu	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kissell	Schiff
Clay	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Langevin	Scott, David
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cooper	Levin	Shuler
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Costello	Lipinski	Slaughter
Courtney	Loebuck	Smith (WA)
Critz	Loftgren, Zoe	Speier
Crowley	Lowey	Stark
Cuellar	Lujan	Sutton
Cummings	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	Markey	Tierney
DeFazio	Matheson	Tonko
DeGette	Matsui	Towns
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Deutch	McCollum	Van Hollen
Dicks	McDermott	Velázquez
Dingell	McGovern	Visclosky
Doggett	McIntyre	Walz (MN)
Donnelly (IN)	McNerney	Wasserman
Doyle	Meeks	Schultz
Edwards	Michaud	Waters
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Watt
Engel	Miller, George	Waxman
Eshoo	Moore	Weiner
Farr	Moran	Welch
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Filner	Napolitano	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Neal	Wu
Fudge	Oliver	Yarmuth

NOES—244

Adams	Calvert	Fincher
Aderholt	Camp	Fitzpatrick
Akin	Campbell	Flake
Alexander	Canseco	Fleischmann
Altmire	Cantor	Fleming
Amash	Capito	Flores
Austria	Carter	Forbes
Bachmann	Cassidy	Fortenberry
Bachus	Chabot	Fox
Barletta	Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)
Bartlett	Chandler	Frelinghuysen
Barton (TX)	Coble	Gallely
Bass (NH)	Coffman (CO)	Gardner
Benishke	Cole	Garrett
Berg	Conaway	Gerlach
Biggart	Cravaack	Gibbs
Bilbray	Crawford	Gibson
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Gohmert
Black	Davis (KY)	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Denham	Gosar
Bonner	Dent	Gowdy
Bono Mack	DesJarlais	Granger
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Graves (GA)
Brady (TX)	Dold	Graves (MO)
Brooks	Dreier	Griffin (AR)
Broun (GA)	Duffy	Griffith (VA)
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Grimm
Bucshon	Duncan (TN)	Guinta
Buerkle	Ellmers	Guthrie
Burgess	Emerson	Hall
Burton (IN)	Farenthold	Hanna

Harper	McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Brady (PA)	Heinrich	Pascrell	Lamborn	Paul	Scott, Austin
Harris	McCotter	Roskam	Braley (IA)	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)	Lance	Paulsen	Sensenbrenner
Hartzler	McHenry	Ross (FL)	Brown (FL)	Himes	Payne	Landry	Pearce	Sessions
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Royce	Butterfield	Hinchev	Pelosi	Lankford	Pence	Shimkus
Hayworth	McKinley	Runyan	Capps	Hinojosa	Perlmutter	Latham	Peters	Shuler
Heck	McMorris	Ryan (WI)	Capuano	Hirono	Pingree (ME)	LaTourette	Peterson	Shuster
Heller	Rodgers	Scalise	Carnahan	Holt	Polis	Latta	Petri	Simpson
Hensarling	Meehan	Schilling	Carney	Honda	Price (NC)	Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Herger	Mica	Schmidt	Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Quigley	LoBiondo	Platts	Smith (NJ)
Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Schock	Castor (FL)	Inslee	Rahall	Long	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)
Holden	Miller (MI)	Schrader	Chu	Israel	Rangel	Lucas	Pompeo	Smith (WA)
Huelskamp	Miller, Gary	Schweikert	Cicilline	Jackson (IL)	Reyes	Luetkemeyer	Posey	Southerland
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Scott (SC)	Clarke (MI)	Jackson Lee	Richardson	Lummis	Price (GA)	Stearns
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin	Clarke (NY)	(TX)	Richmond	Lungren, Daniel	Quayle	Stivers
Hunter	Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Clay	Johnson (GA)	Ross (AR)	E.	Reed	Stutzman
Hurt	Neugebauer	Sessions	Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman (NJ)	Mack	Rehberg	Sullivan
Issa	Noem	Shimkus	Clyburn	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard	Manzullo	Reichert	Terry
Jenkins	Nugent	Shuster	Connolly (VA)	Keating	Ruppersberger	Marino	Renacci	Thompson (PA)
Johnson (IL)	Nunes	Simpson	Conyers	Kildee	Rush	McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Thornberry
Johnson (OH)	Nunnelee	Smith (NE)	Costello	Kind	Ryan (OH)	McCaul	Rigell	Tiberi
Johnson, Sam	Olson	Smith (NJ)	Courtney	Kissell	Sánchez, Linda	McClintock	Rivera	Tipton
Jones	Palazzo	Smith (TX)	Critz	Kucinich	T.	McCotter	Roby	Turner
Jordan	Paul	Southerland	Crowley	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta	McHenry	Roe (TN)	Upton
Kelly	Paulsen	Stearns	Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes	McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
King (IA)	Pearce	Stivers	Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky	McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
King (NY)	Pence	Stutzman	Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schiff	McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Walsh (IL)
Kingston	Peterson	Sullivan	Davis (IL)	Levin	Scott (VA)	Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Webster
Kinzinger (IL)	Petri	Terry	DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David	Meehan	Rokita	West
Kline	Pitts	Thompson (PA)	DeGette	Lipinski	Serrano	Mica	Rooney	Westmoreland
Lamborn	Platts	Thornberry	DeLauro	Loeb sack	Sewell	Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Lance	Poe (TX)	Tipton	Deutch	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman	Miller (MI)	Ross (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Landry	Pompeo	Turner	Dicks	Lowey	Sires	Miller, Gary	Royce	Wittman
Lankford	Posey	Upton	Dingell	Luján	Slaughter	Mulvaney	Runyan	Wolf
Latham	Posey (GA)	Walberg	Speier	Lynch	Starkey	Murphy (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Womack
LaTourette	Quayle	Walden	Maloney	Maloney	Sutton	Myrick	Scalise	Woodall
Latta	Reed	Walsh (IL)	Doyle	Markey	Thompson (CA)	Neugebauer	Schilling	Yoder
Lewis (CA)	Rehberg	Webster	Dreier	Matheson	Thompson (MS)	Noem	Schmidt	Young (AK)
LoBiondo	Reichert	West	Edwards	Matsui	Tierney	Nugent	Schock	Young (FL)
Long	Renacci	Westmoreland	Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko	Nunes	Schrader	Young (IN)
Lucas	Ribble	Whitfield	Engel	McCollum	Towns	Nunnelee	Schweikert	
Luetkemeyer	Rigell	Wilson (SC)	Esholt	McDermott	Tsongas	Olson	Scott (SC)	
Lummis	Rivera	Wittman	Farr	McGovern	Van Hollen	Palazzo		
Lungren, Daniel	Roby	Wolf	Fattah	McIntyre	Velázquez			
E.	Roe (TN)	Womack	Filner	McNerney	Walz (MN)			
Mack	Rogers (AL)	Woodall	Frank (MA)	Meeke	Wasserman			
Manzullo	Rogers (KY)	Yoder	Fudge	Michaud	Schultz			
Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)	Garamendi	Miller (NC)	Waters			
Marino	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)	Gonzalez	Miller, George	Watt			
McCarthy (CA)	Rokita	Young (IN)	Green, Al	Moore	Waxman			
McCaul	Rooney		Green, Gene	Moran	Weiner			
			Grijalva	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)			
			Gutierrez	Napolitano	Woolsey			
			Hanabusa	Neal	Wu			
			Harris	Olver	Yarmuth			
			Hastings (FL)	Pallone				

NOT VOTING—5

Cohen
Giffords

□ 1749

Messrs. BERG, PENCE, PITTS, and YOUNG of Indiana changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

AYES—174

Ackerman	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Andrews	Becerra	Bishop (NY)
Baca	Berkley	Blumenauer
Baldwin	Berman	Boswell

NOES—248

Adams	Chabot	Gohmert
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Goodlatte
Akin	Chandler	Gosar
Alexander	Coble	Gowdy
Altmire	Coffman (CO)	Granger
Amash	Cole	Graves (GA)
Austria	Conaway	Graves (MO)
Bachmann	Cooper	Griffin (AR)
Bachus	Costa	Griffith (VA)
Barletta	Cravaack	Grimm
Bartlett	Crawford	Guinta
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Bass (NH)	Culberson	Hall
Benish	Davis (KY)	Hanna
Berg	Denham	Harper
Biggart	Dent	Hartzler
Bilbray	DesJarlais	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Bishop (UT)	Dold	Heck
Black	Duffy	Heller
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling
Bonner	Duncan (TN)	Herger
Bono Mack	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler
Boren	Emerson	Holden
Boustany	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Broun (GA)	Flake	Hunter
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Hurt
Bucshon	Fleming	Issa
Buerkle	Flores	Jenkins
Burgess	Forbes	Johnson (IL)
Burton (IN)	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Jones
Campbell	Gallegly	Jordan
Canseco	Gardner	Kelly
Cantor	Garrett	King (IA)
Capito	Gerlach	King (NY)
Cardoza	Gibbs	Kingston
Carter	Gibson	Kinzing (IL)
Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	Kline

NOT VOTING—10

Bass (CA)	Labrador	Schwartz
Cohen	Marchant	Welch
Franks (AZ)	Nadler	
Giffords	Owens	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1757

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 249, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

AYES—178

Ackerman	Becerra	Boswell
Andrews	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Baca	Berman	Braley (IA)
Baldwin	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Barrow	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Bass (CA)	Blumenauer	Capps

[illegible]

Luetkemeyer	Petri	Sessions
Lummis	Pitts	Shimkus
Lungren, Daniel	Platts	Shuster
E.	Poe (TX)	Simpson
Mack	Pompeo	Smith (NE)
Manzullo	Posey	Smith (NJ)
Marchant	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
Marino	Quayle	Southerland
McCarthy (CA)	Reed	Stearns
McCaul	Rehberg	Stivers
McClintock	Reichert	Stutzman
McCotter	Ribble	Sullivan
McHenry	Rigell	Terry
McKeon	Rivera	Thompson (PA)
McKinley	Roby	Thornberry
McMorris	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Turner
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Upton
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Walberg
Miller, Gary	Rooney	Walden
Mulvaney	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh (IL)
Murphy (PA)	Roskam	Webster
Myrick	Ross (FL)	West
Neugebauer	Royce	Westmoreland
Noem	Runyan	Whitfield
Nugent	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)
Nunes	Scalise	Wittman
Nunnelee	Schilling	Wolf
Olson	Schmidt	Womack
Palazzo	Schock	Woodall
Paul	Schrader	Yoder
Paulsen	Schweikert	Young (AK)
Pearce	Scott (SC)	Young (FL)
Pence	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)
Peterson	Sensenbrenner	

NOT VOTING—7

Cohen	Labrador	Schwartz
Giffords	Nadler	
Johnson (OH)	Renacci	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1809

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 861) to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program, and, pursuant to House Resolution 170, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Braley of Iowa moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 861, to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 3(b)(1), before “shall continue” insert the following: “, and all amounts made available for use pursuant to subsection (d),”.

In section 3(c), before “, and outlays” insert “or under subsection (d)”.

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(d) CONTINUATION OF STATE PROGRAM; PRIORITY FOR RURAL AREAS.—There is authorized to be appropriated an amount equal to the portion of the unobligated balances described in section 2 that, pursuant to the provision of law specified in section 2, was allocated to States. Any amounts made available pursuant to the authorization under this subsection shall be used for assistance under the same provisions of law applicable to the amounts made available by the provision of law specified in section 2, except that assistance made available pursuant to the authorization under this subsection shall be allocated only to States and any State that receives an allocation from such amounts shall, in distributing such allocated amounts, give priority emphasis and consideration to rural areas (within the meaning given such term for purposes of the provision of law specified in section 2).

In section 4, after “(NSP)” insert the following: “for assistance for units of general local government”.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this picture tells the story of why this amendment is so important. This isn't Wall Street. You don't see any hedge fund managers or investment bankers here. They are doing pretty well these days. This isn't the headquarters of BP.

Most small towns are lucky to have a single convenience store, and they are even luckier if that convenience store sells gasoline. This is a Main Street in my State of Iowa, and there are far too many of these in communities in my State and in my district. And I guar-

antee you, there are far too many of these in rural communities in your States. Because while Wall Street and big corporations are doing fine, our rural communities and small towns are facing a real crisis, and the Neighborhood Stabilization Program is making a real difference in rural America.

I want to tell you about a woman from Oelwein, a small town in my district. She is 23 years old. She only makes \$22,000 a year working at a day care. She grew up in Oelwein and she wants to raise her children in Oelwein, and the national Neighborhood Stabilization Program is helping her become a first-time homeowner.

Now, our amendment would simply take the money that has already been allocated for this program and prioritize it for our rural communities so we can change the way that streets like this look, and so we can make sure that more moms can raise their kids in the towns where they grew up. This amendment doesn't cost any money. It allows a mom to raise a child in her home community. And our amendment will not kill this bill. It would simply give our rural communities the ability to weather the worst crisis they have faced in a generation.

Now, maybe our small towns or this young mom should incorporate as a bank. Maybe then they would get the same kind of attention that we have given to Wall Street. Because, folks, Wall Street is getting through this crisis; Main Streets are not. And it is time we answer this question: Are we going to stand with Wall Street and Big Oil and corporate CEOs, or are we going to stand up for small towns all across America that need our help now more than ever?

At this time, I yield to my good friend from the State of Iowa, Congressman BOSWELL.

Mr. BOSWELL. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this. And, again, I want to say this amendment does not kill the bill.

Republicans have put forth a bill that again forces our middle class and our working families to sacrifice, sacrifice, and sacrifice so they can continue the giveaways for Big Oil, billionaires, and corporations that outsource American jobs.

As a former professional soldier, I approach our economy with a military eye to take the hill and get our economy going again, and we need all of our troops behind us. In this case, our troops are our workers, the middle class Americans who must be healthy and armed with the tools to rebuild the economy. Our camps are the communities that must have the resources to do just that. So why are our troops and communities in rural America being left behind?

Rural Main Streets in Iowa have been devastated as Republicans have rewarded outsourcing. Manufacturing plants in my district, like Maytag—all of you know who Maytag is—in Newton, Iowa, they have packed up and

moved their jobs to Mexico. Many of you have similar situations.

Rural workers have lost jobs in ethanol, biodiesel, and wind turbine plants because we have given tax breaks to Big Oil while cutting investments in renewable energy. These communities have weathered farm crisis after crisis, as Republicans defend Wall Street speculators tinkering with the markets that they depend on.

I urge my colleagues to say “yes” to rural America and the middle class by supporting this amendment to H.R. 861. Rural America is not blue or red. Rural America is simply hardworking communities that are already struggling to keep the American Dream alive for their residents who live, work, and believe in them.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, to many people, rural America is a policy or a program. To Congressman BOWELL and me, it is where we came from. That is why I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. That was a very nice picture of a storefront. It was not a picture of a home. Now, why would you impose a terrible program on rural America that you don't want on urban America?

You have to say we have given away \$6 billion of taxpayer monies and it will never come back to the Federal Government. We are saying let's preserve the last billion dollars.

There is a huge lack of accountability in this program. The inspector general of HUD has already identified multiple misuses of NSP money at the State level. The GAO has questioned the information system that places HUD at risk using the tracking system.

How many of you want to use your money to buy this house that Chairman BACHUS has pointed out? Nobody. But, taxpayers, guess what? We are using your money. The biggest problem with this program is unfair allocation.

Now, rural America, you probably got ripped off in this whole process like everybody else did because, let's see, where did the money go? In the NSP 1, we spent \$4 billion. In the NSP 2, \$1.93 billion. We are saying the last billion dollars, let's at least save that for the taxpayers and use it for some beneficial purpose.

Where did the money go? Let's see if it was fairly distributed. Let's look at my area. L.A. County got \$26.3 million. San Bernardino County, one of the hardest hit, got \$33.2 million. Orange County got \$4.3 million. San Diego

County, \$5.1 million. A total of \$68.9 million on hard-hit counties.

Now, let's see. What did nongovernment agency groups get out there that are incorporated? Neighborhood Lending Partners, Incorporated got \$50 million; the Community Builders, Incorporated got \$78.6 million; Los Angeles Neighborhood Housing Service, Incorporated got \$60 million; Neighborhood Lending Partners of West Florida, Incorporated got \$50 million; and Chicanos por la Causa, Inc. got \$137 million.

Now, all of my counties got \$68.9 million; the Community Builders got \$78.6 million; Chicanos por la Causa got \$137 million. Is that considered nonequitable qualification? It is nonequitable, period. It does not make sense. And we say \$1.3 billion went to nongovernment agencies.

Now, somebody said I was racist because I said Chicanos por la Causa got \$137 million. They got 10 percent of all the funds given to nongovernment agencies. If it was Germans for Affordable Housing that got \$137 million, I would oppose it just like I oppose this one.

Now, taxpayers understand, clearly, it did not prevent one foreclosure in this entire country. Not one person got to keep their home because we spent \$6 billion. In fact, imagine the family who owned the home. Maybe the ma or pa got in trouble with their job. They couldn't quite make the payments. For the last 3 years, they have been unable to repair the plumbing. They couldn't replace the oven that wasn't working. A couple windows were broken out.

□ 1820

The house needed painting. And they had to sit there and let their house go back to the lender, to watch some entity, a nonprofit or government agency, buy that home, fix it up, and sell it to somebody else. How would you feel when nobody came to your aid when you were losing your home, but yet your tax dollars were used to buy that home to give it to somebody else?

Now, understand clearly, the argument they have made is look at all the money we gave to bail out the banks. Well, I got an update from Treasury today. Ninety-nine percent of the money that we lent to banks has been paid back. And, guess what? We made \$20 billion on it. But we gave \$7 billion away to this program. So, yes, we made 20, and we ended up with a net 13, by lending the money that you say bailed out the banks. It was a loan.

This program does nothing but say we are going to send you a check, and you never send us a dime back. And the sweet part is you can pay any amount of money you want for the house. It is almost impossible to violate the terms of this deal, because there are no conditions. You can pay \$800,000 for a house and sell it for \$50. The requirement is whatever you pay for the house, plus whatever you pay to rehabilitate the house, you have to sell it for less.

And it doesn't say who you have to sell it to. A nonprofit, I am not saying they would, could have a cousin who wanted to buy the house that they paid \$180,000 for and they could sell it legitimately for \$20,000, and, guess what? You have not violated the terms of NSP 1, 2 or 3, and you have not broken the law. And when you sell the house, if you sell it, you can take the money and recycle it again. You could even take this money and do a private venture with a private group, splitting profits, and, falling under the conditions of how you buy the house and sell the house, money gets split. There are very few restrictions in this bill.

This is a terrible bill. I would encourage a “no” vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 153, noes 272, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

AYES—153

Ackerman	Edwards	Luján
Andrews	Ellison	Maloney
Baca	Engel	Matsui
Baldwin	Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)
Barrow	Farr	McCollum
Bass (CA)	Fattah	McDermott
Bishop (GA)	Filner	McGovern
Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	McIntyre
Blumenauer	Fudge	McNerney
Boren	Garamendi	Meeks
Boswell	Gonzalez	Michaud
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Braley (IA)	Grijalva	Miller, George
Brown (FL)	Gutierrez	Moore
Butterfield	Hanabusa	Moran
Capps	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)
Cardoza	Heinrich	Napolitano
Carnahan	Higgins	Olver
Carson (IN)	Hinchee	Owens
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Pallone
Chandler	Hirono	Pascarell
Chu	Holden	Pastor (AZ)
Cicilline	Holt	Payne
Clarke (MI)	Honda	Pelosi
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Clay	Inslee	Pingree (ME)
Cleaver	Israel	Polis
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Courtney	Kaptur	Reyes
Critz	Keating	Richmond
Crowley	Kind	Ross (AR)
Cuellar	Kissell	Rothman (NJ)
Cummings	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Levin	Sanchez, Linda
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	T.
Deutch	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Dicks	Loeb	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
Doyle	Lowey	Schrader

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

NOES—272

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett

NOES—272

Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
West

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1838

Messrs. WATT, MARKEY, KUCINICH, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. BERKLEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 182, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

AYES—242

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Crawford

Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler

Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon

McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi

Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson

NOES—182

Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Owens

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Cohen
Giffords
Labrador

Moore
Nadler
Schrader

Schwartz
Wasserman
Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1845

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1076, PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING OF NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-35) on the resolution (H. Res. 174) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 979

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as cosponsor of the bill (H.R. 979) to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to ensure program integrity, transparency, and cost savings in the pricing and contracting of prescription drug benefits under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE MIAMI HEBREW ACADEMY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary school in my south Florida community, the Miami Hebrew Academy. Founded in 1947 with just a handful of students, the Hebrew Academy was the first Jewish day school in the southeastern United States.

Today, the Hebrew Academy has grown to over 600 students and serves with distinction the educational and religious needs of our Jewish families and students. In addition to a phenomenal general education, students of the Miami Hebrew Academy are taught the values of the Torah, the benefits of a strong American-Israeli partnership, and the importance of Holocaust education.

I cannot thank the Hebrew Academy enough for its leadership in both the general and spiritual education of our south Florida community.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sympathy for the people of Japan as they battle a nuclear disaster that threatens lives and their environment, and I rise to reject calls for more wasteful spending, \$100 billion more of wasteful spending, on the Yucca Mountain project in response to Japan's nuclear tragedy.

Dumping radioactive waste on top of an earthquake fault located inside a volcanic zone 90 miles outside of Las Vegas will only increase the danger to Americans from radioactive waste produced at nuclear power plants. Nuclear industry plans call for decades of waste shipments to be unleashed on communities across the United States that are unprepared to deal with the death and destruction that this radioactive garbage can cause.

Whether it's a tragic accident involving a train or a truck carrying nuclear waste or a deliberate 9/11 style terrorist attack on even one shipment, the risk to human lives and the potential for billions of dollars in economic damage is staggering.

Let us stop pushing Yucca Mountain and start focusing on securing waste at existing plant sites, stored in hardened bunkers engineered to keep this material isolated from our fellow citizens. With what we are witnessing in Japan, these pro-dump forces should put concern for safeguarding lives above concerns about profits.

IN MEMORY OF DERRY BROWNFIELD

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I come to the floor today to mourn the passing of Derry Brownfield, a pioneer in the farm broadcasting industry. As the only agri-reporter and farm broadcaster in Congress, I feel compelled to honor him today.

Derry's influence across the farm broadcasting industry was far-reaching, and it will be felt for years to come. While many overlook the importance of agri-reporting, Derry understood the necessity. He prided himself on "speaking as a farmer, to the farmer, for the farmer, from the farm."

His vision and passion for informing and educating rural America was unparalleled and an inspiration to the farmers and farm broadcasters he influenced. There is now a noticeable hole in the agriculture community, but we can take what Derry taught us and

honor his legacy by continuing the tradition of quality agricultural reporting.

□ 1850

HONORING ST. PATRICK'S DAY

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the great holiday of St. Patrick's Day. My district is home to the largest population of Irish Americans in the Nation. Like many of my constituents, my paternal grandparents emigrated from Ireland at the turn of the 20th century. When they came to this country, they had all their worldly possessions in one trunk each. Thereafter, they had eight children, five of whom served in our Armed Forces, one of whom gave his life for this country.

So many of my friends and neighbors share similar stories of sacrifice and dedication to family and to their new country. It is no wonder that Irish Americans have come to embody the values of loyalty, community, and hard work in the fabric of our Nation.

As they say, everyone is Irish on St. Patrick's Day. So let us all embody those values as we tackle the challenges facing our Nation currently.

May the road rise up to you,

May the wind be always at your back,

May the sun shine warm upon your face,

The rains fall soft upon your fields and,

Until we meet again,

May God hold you in the palm of His hand.

RETREAT?

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 9 months after the administration sent 1,200 National Guard troops to the border, Washington has decided that it is time for the troops to withdraw. In my opinion, this decision is dangerously irresponsible. Violence has already spilled into the United States from Mexico. The 16 Texas border counties are packed with foreign nationals charged with serious crimes in the United States.

According to the GAO, 56 percent of the border is wide open; and instead of fulfilling their duty to protect the people of this country, Washington orders retreat. It defies logic that we would remove the National Guard from the border. If anything, we need more troops on the ground.

Doesn't Washington know that the border is a war zone? To abandon the third front puts Americans at risk with cross-border crime. This is a national security issue that cannot be ignored. It is the first duty of the Federal Government to protect the people and the homeland, not order retreat.

And that's just the way it is.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR JAPAN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise this evening on behalf of the people of the State of Ohio to offer our great heartfelt support to our brothers and sisters in the nation of Japan. Every person in the world really is bound with compassion and with hope that we can find a way to help heal the great damage that is occurring there and has occurred. I know that we have over 12 naval vessels that have moved across the Pacific to offer assistance, and nations around the world will try to help the people of Japan.

My message this evening is one of hope to the Japanese people, so many that I have met in my own career, certainly their national leaders in the Diet, in their executives, so many educational leaders, and just the people of Japan who have been so kind to us on our visits there. I hope they know that Japanese Americans living in our country, certainly in Ohio's Ninth District, are bound with them in an attitude of rebuilding and healing.

As the State of Ohio's name mean "hello," we offer tonight a very special hello to the valiant people of Japan.

OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do echo the comments of my friend from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). Our hearts do go out, our prayers do go out for the people in Japan, difficult time there.

At the same time, there are so many people struggling in this country. There are so many people out of work; and although in the last week gas prices have come down some, sadly in the wake of the Japan tragedy, there is no doubt speculation will eventually go back up unless this administration stops, ceases, desists in putting our natural resources off limits for our use to help our economy to create jobs for our citizens. You know, certainly other countries welcome the pigheadedness of those in charge of this administration who are determined to keep us from using our own resources.

We had a hearing today in the Natural Resources Committee, and the chairman of the Railroad Commission, the regulating body in Texas, Ms. Elizabeth Jones, had indicated—and I was not aware of what exactly she had said—but, apparently, this administration is making a big deal of reopening and granting a permit that actually was not a new permit. This is something that had been pending that was a re-release and was not a new permit.

And how ironic, the ultimate irony, that this administration's first supposed new permit would be to a drilling project in which British Petroleum, BP, would be the major investor. How about that? This administration simply cannot get away from trying to help their buddies at BP.

It was interesting to hear our friend across the aisle from Massachusetts in our hearing today indicate that in the European waters, off their coasts, they have the same driller, the same international companies; and yet, the safety records over there are much better than they are in the Gulf of Mexico. Quite interesting because the only difference is, in this country, the administration is run by those who help out President Obama, and they have sadly looked the other way while BP racked up safety violation after safety violation, after dozens of safety violations.

In the meantime, the other major drillers had one, two violations over the same period. BP racked up dozens of violations and then hundreds of violations until they had reached around 800 safety violations. But did this administration rein them in? No.

And then we later read that actually when this administration could not bring itself to really come down on BP after the disastrous blowout of the Deepwater Horizon, that BP executives were negotiating and working out the day, the time, the place that they would come out in support of President Obama's and our Democratic colleagues' great pride and joy called the cap-and-trade bill. I don't want to offend people by calling it the crap-and-trade bill, so we will call it the cap-and-trade bill instead of what I really think it is.

But they were negotiating to come out and be the administration's one big international energy company that embraced this whole cap-and-trade bill. Why? Because they had special perks they were getting out of it with regard to carbon sales, and so they were coming onboard.

□ 1900

Well, of course this administration did not want to come down on BP when they were going to be the big energy company that came out saying, Yes, we're for this cap-and-trade bill. Yes, we think it's good. Why? Because we're going to get rich off of it even though Americans are going to be paying out the nose for energy once this thing kicks in. Americans will be losing their jobs right and left; but, boy, we will make a lot of money because we're cronies with the administration. So they were going to come out in support.

The administration didn't want to shut them down. They were hoping that what BP was telling them about it not really being that big of a deal would be true. So of course the President didn't fly down there immediately, like he had said about President Bush that he should have after Katrina. This President waited and

waited, really didn't want to come down on BP because these were his buddies that were going to help him get across the finish line the cap-and-trade bill. They were the guys that had safety violation after safety violation. So it gets a little difficult to hear friends across the aisle talk about cronyism when we know that when you really examine the facts where the cronyism lies.

We have heard people talk about how offensive it was that there were offshore leases that had language removed from the pricing from which royalties were paid that cost the United States Treasury billions of dollars in royalties that rightfully would have been the U.S. Treasury's, except that our hearings indicated that there was actually at least one or two people in the Clinton administration who had it pointed out. Hey, we need this language in here that allows us to get the amount of royalties we should. But they were instructed, We are leaving it out here.

When we had a hearing with a friend of the Clinton administration, a former appointee of the Clinton administration who had done his research, I asked him why he had not questioned those people who had ordered that that language be kept out. He said, Well, they left the administration, so we really can't question them. They are in the private sector now.

Well, you do a little further research, and you find out that the private sector, these people that cost the United States Government billions of dollars and made billions of dollars for the cronies of the Democrats in the Big Oil, they actually had gone to work for British Petroleum. How about that. So to have heard the former Clinton appointee who did the investigations say, Well, I couldn't possibly question these people because they left, and they were in the private sector, I was surprised because if someone intentionally and knowingly defrauds the government, it's a crime. And the FBI doesn't have any trouble normally going after folks, subpoenaing records. They know how to do it. They do it quite well. But they didn't go after these individuals because—well, they had left government service, and this one in particular had gone to work for British Petroleum. How about that.

So imagine our surprise in 2009 when we find out that the person who was most knowledgeable about the language being taken out that cost us billions of dollars and had gone to work for British Petroleum had now been brought on to the Obama administration to supervise these offshore leases. How about that. Or to quote our friends from Saturday Night Live: "What's up with that?" It cost the country billions of dollars, went to work for British Petroleum, and then you bring them back on and put them in charge of the offshore leases?

Then we find out that those who worked for the Interior Department,

the offshore rig inspectors who stand between this country and disastrous problems off the coast that are man-made, are the ones within the Bureau of Land Management that were allowed to unionize.

Well, that sounds kind of strange because, you know, union negotiations—normally, if you go back to the inception of unions, it was to overcome issues of corporate greed. It didn't seem to fit here because here were people that were supposed to stand between our Nation and man-made disasters off our coast. And they were allowed to unionize because we know unions, they'll negotiate—oops, these folks can't work too many hours, can't work too many hours in succession. You have got to do this. You can't go—you know, there are all kinds of things negotiated. It would be like negotiating a union contract on behalf of the military soldiers. You can't overwork them. You can't expect them to work too late into the evening, travel too much.

When people are standing between us and disaster, it just is not appropriate to have contracts negotiated in a union manner, because they stand between us and disaster. It's not appropriate for people in the military, and it's not appropriate for our offshore rig inspectors. If they have to work extra hours, if they have to travel extra, if they have to do some task to ensure that our country does not get devastated because of man-made negligence, a disaster off our coast, they will have to do that job; and if you don't like it, go to work for the private sector.

That is the way it was supposed to be, not to have unions organize people who stand between us and disaster. Because if you go back to the founding, the Founders anticipated—and some of them wrote in their letters, in their diaries that we had within our grasp, they indicated, the chance to do what philosophers had only dreamed about, to govern ourselves.

We can understand the need for union collective bargaining, to overcome corporate greed in cases where it's occurred; but to need unions to extort things from the government that is supposed to be "We, the people," in a democratic Republic? Offshore inspectors standing between us and disaster, and they get to have a bargaining session where, Gee, we don't want them to work too many hours even if it meant saving America, saving thousands of jobs.

Well, in the hearing where we heard from the director of the Bureau of Land Management who was over that whole system, when I asked, What are the checks and balances? Since you have these offshore inspectors unionized, what are the checks and balances that protect us from disaster? It should be these offshore inspectors. So how do you ensure that the allegations that we read and have been hearing that some of the administration's offshore inspectors had been bribed, have been given

perks to look the other way with safety violations, and they had done so—we've read allegations of that kind of thing. So what is it that protects us and ensures there are checks and balances to make sure offshore inspectors are not bribed, are not given things to make them look the other way?

And the director indicated they do have a solid system of checks and balances for such offshore inspectors. They send them out in teams of two people at a time. That way, we can rest assured that if one inspector were subjected to some type of bribe or perk, something to look the other way, the other inspector would report them, would refuse to accept the bribe or the perk to look the other way, so that we could rest assured that we were protected.

□ 1910

Apparently, she was not aware that I was aware that the last two-person team of inspectors that went out, sent by this administration out to the Deepwater Horizon before the disastrous blowout, was a father and son unionized inspection team. That's who was sent to stand between us and disaster.

Now, there are some disasters, like earthquakes, like tsunamis, that insurance companies call acts of God. I still do, too. I don't believe that God causes those things to happen to punish people. I think He has the power to do so.

But we do have the power to build and to inspect and to prepare for disasters so that we can mitigate and minimize damages after such things occur. But you can't very well mitigate and minimize when you're allowing the kind of abuses that have gone on from this administration with the cronies in Big Oil like British Petroleum.

And it's interesting to have heard, today, friends across the aisle trying to wrap British Petroleum around Republicans' necks as an albatross when, actually, the group that has protected British Petroleum over and over has allowed them to continue to drill, and when this administration finally got around to granting a new permit that really wasn't new after all, it happens to be to their cronies, their buddies—good old crony capitalism—where BP is the major investor. How about that? Another "and what's up with that?"

BP gets the latest right to drill in the gulf when others have lost thousands of jobs, families have been left destitute. And that means not just that the workers who work on those oil rigs have been hurt, their families have been hurt, and then all the places where they did business have been hurt. The restaurants, clothing stores, everybody who did business with those have been suffering because this administration did not punish the company responsible for nearly 800 safety violations. It punished all those who were not their cronies.

And how ironic that the biggest financial supporter of this administration and Democratic politics, in George

Soros, had as his biggest individual investment in Brazilian drilling, oil and gas.

How ironic that when this administration granted a \$2 billion loan from the United States of money—we don't have over 40 cents of every dollar of that \$2 billion that we have to borrow and pay interest on—we loaned it to Brazil to do offshore drilling that we won't allow here.

Oh, but by the way, that helps the Democrats' biggest supporter financially, George Soros, with his biggest individual investment; so, therefore, it's okay to drill off the coast of Brazil with money borrowed from America at low interest rates that we have to borrow from other countries at a different interest rate. That's just astounding.

And then we have calls to eliminate the method that has produced over 100 years, perhaps 200 years, of natural gas reserves. We've been provided information that indicates that if all of the 18-wheelers in America started utilizing natural gas instead of gasoline or diesel, then we would cut our dependency on those who hate us by 50 percent. But no, we're not going to do that.

In fact, there are measures being pushed by this administration and the EPA to eliminate our ability to utilize over 100, 200 years of natural gas that could provide our electricity, even cutting the need for more nuclear power plants. It could be of tremendous assistance in cutting our reliance on foreign oil. And this administration wants to eliminate that ability. It makes no sense.

Our hearts still go out to Japan for the decimation that's occurred, for the loss of life and the livelihoods, and this administration has expressed that so eloquently. But not so for this administration's actual activities to help the lives and livelihoods in the gulf coast area of those who this administration didn't save their job. They cost them their job. They cost them their livelihood. They caused gasoline prices to go up because we will not help ourselves.

We were told when gasoline reached \$4 a gallon that probably 25 percent or more of that was speculation. Well, when speculators see that we're doing nothing to help ourselves with our own energy needs and, in fact, we're making it more and more difficult to produce our own oil, gas, natural resources to take care of ourselves and instead are going deeper and deeper in debt to countries that don't like us—thank goodness we're friends with Canada, and they're helpful in our energy needs. But we're funding some of the very terrorism we're concerned about in the Middle East because we refuse to use our own natural resources.

I was told by a Chinese gentleman that he thought he had figured out what our energy policy was, because often the Chinese, they look farsighted. They look down the road. They try to examine issues and policies in a farsighted manner generations down the road, when we here in America sometimes have a hard time looking at what

we're going to do tonight. Certainly, tomorrow is a stretch.

But, anyway, this Chinese gentleman had said, I think we figured out what you are doing. You continue constantly to put your own natural resources off limits, and that forces the rest of the world to use all of their natural resources. And then eventually everyone will have used their natural resources but you, and then you'll be the only one with natural resources. You'll still be the superpower, and you'll still be the superdominant country in the world because everyone else lost their resources. They're used up, and you still have yours.

And I told him, I wish I could take credit and say you caught us; that's our plan. Everybody else used up their natural resources. But we haven't been that strategic in our thinking. No, we're just having people say it may devastate the economy. Obviously, it is. It does when you put your natural resources off limits.

But they claim that will save the environment, not understanding that when you devastate an economy and people are losing their jobs and they can't pay their bills, they're not concerned about the environment. They're concerned about getting by and just living. And it's only when you have a vibrant economy, like we did have, that you have a country where we're concerned about pollution of air and water, and we rein it in.

Instead, policies of this administration are sending more and more jobs overseas where they pollute four to ten times more than we do doing the same job, and yet that pollution goes into the same atmosphere and often floats over into our country. Mercury, toxic materials come floating up because we ran those manufacturers off in thinking we were doing some good for the economy and for the environment, and we were hurting both.

□ 1920

That's not the way it works when you have natural resources, when you have been so richly blessed, as we have been in this country, with so many resources. You're expected to be good stewards, to use those resources wisely, but don't be an idiot and not use them. We've been blessed with them. Use them.

Help the environment, help the economy, and you help the world.

As I mentioned here before—but I've not forgotten—a West African told me last year when I was over in West Africa that they were all excited when we elected an African American as President; but they have seen this President's policies weakening America, and he asked me to make sure people here understood that, when we weaken or allow America to grow weaker, we hurt the peace-loving people around the world, particularly Christians, who want to live in peace.

He said, When you allow the United States to get weaker, we don't have

hope of anyone coming to our rescue when people come after us. You're our hope in this world. Please tell your friends in Congress and in the administration, Don't keep weakening your country. You're hurting those who hope and want peace around the world.

We owe it to ourselves. We owe it to all of those who want peace around the world and who count on us to act responsibly.

I know the Obama administration and those in the Interior Department have said, Gee, we're not going to be allowing these risky ventures out in the Gulf of Mexico. Yet they turn around and let the most unconscionable violator of safety regulations be the major investor in the permit they just released.

And what about these major oil companies that keep being demonized? A moratorium in the gulf has caused many of them to move rigs to other countries. They won't be back for a number of years, if at all. We're costing ourselves thousands of jobs, and we're forcing ourselves to send more money to countries that hate our guts.

And what about those who are unable to just move because they're international, big companies—the independent oil companies—of which we have numerous in Texas and in Louisiana and in other Gulf States? Well, they can't just take off and go to Brazil or go to other countries. They go out of business. They've got nowhere else to go because this administration is putting them and those they hire and those they buy from out of business.

It makes no sense to keep shooting ourselves in the foot and hurting those who rely on us.

Now, we've had a temporary cessation in the explosion in gas prices. There is a chance here that the administration will take advantage of it and will quit running off more jobs with more regulations and continuing an actual moratorium, in fact, on offshore drilling. There is a chance that the administration will take advantage of this time-out to say, You know what? We've seen the light. We've heard the human cry from across America about expensive gas prices. We've heard the human cry about 100-plus years of natural gas, so we're going to encourage cars or 18-wheelers to start utilizing natural gas for their fuel. It does not produce carbon monoxide, which truly is poisonous and dangerous to human life.

So it's a good idea. My friend across the aisle, DAN BOREN, has a great bill. I'm hoping that the House will move it, that the Senate will take it up and that the President will sign it, and we can help ourselves get off such an incredible reliance on foreign oil.

It's time to start helping ourselves. It's time for people to stop helping those simply because they've helped them get elected. It's time for people here in Washington to follow our oath, to protect our country, and that in-

cludes helping to create a strong economy. That means, like doctors who have taken the oath to do no harm, we should take the same oath:

First, do no harm. Quit trying to force people out of business because you don't like them.

Once we do that, we'll be on the road to a greater economy than this Nation has ever experienced.

Now I want to finish up. I was given a book of an historical nature. It's called, "Mr. JONES, Meet the Master." It has sermons and prayers of Peter Marshall during his time as Chaplain of the United States Senate during the 1940s. It has got some wonderful material in here, and I would just like to finish my time by reading a prayer by the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate as he prayed it in the U.S. Senate. Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall prayed these words in the U.S. Senate:

"Our Father in Heaven, give us the long view of our work and our world.

"Help us to see that it is better to fail in a cause that will ultimately succeed than to succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail.

"May Thy will be done here, and may Thy program be carried out, above party and personality, beyond time and circumstance, for the good of America and the peace of the world. Through Jesus Christ Our Lord, amen."

That was the prayer of Chaplain Peter Marshall during his time as Chaplain of the United States Senate.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON. I claim the time on behalf of the Progressive Caucus. I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for providing the time so that we can share our views and opinions about the world we live in and about the importance of Congress' being responsive to the American people.

Tonight, I am here on behalf of the Progressive Caucus. The Congressional Progressive Caucus is a caucus in the United States Congress, 83-member-strong, who can be counted on to stand up for peace as opposed to war, who can be counted on to stand up for working and middle class people and economic justice and a fair distribution of our Nation's resources, who can be counted on to stand up for civil and human rights, who believe that color, culture, sexual orientation, and things like this are not important as they relate to the worth or merit of a human being, and we can be counted on to stand up for these ideas that make our country great.

In fact, for every great movement in our country, whether it has been the

civil rights movement, the women's rights movement, whether it has been the right to expand the vote to 18-year-olds, whether it has been the fight to end slavery or to support the rights of working people on the job, including our public employees so imperiled today, it has been Progressives who have made these struggles. It has been conservatives who have always fought progress. They fought against ending slavery. They fought against integration. They fought against women's rights. Always the conservatives have been the ones against moving our country forward, and they are today again.

So we are the Progressive Caucus, and we are proud to be Members of this Congress. We are proud to be able to stand up and articulate a people-focused, American-focused agenda that we know and believe is going to be to the benefit of the American people. We are the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and we are very pleased to be Members of the Congress, standing up for the American people.

Tonight, I am here to talk about the Progressive message.

□ 1930

The Progressive message. The message that we are going to share tonight is protecting the American Dream. Protecting the American Dream, stopping corporate tax cheats, and having a sane budget. That's what we want to talk about tonight, protecting the American Dream.

What is the American Dream? The American Dream is the dream, not the fantasy, but the dream that if you work hard and you live life by the rules, that you will be able to be successful in America; that you will be able to get a job, go to school; that if you live long enough and are blessed to do so, that you will be able to retire with Social Security and Medicare; that your children and grandchildren will be able to get a quality education at a public school if they want to; and that, no matter what color they are or what culture they are or what religion they are, they are welcomed, because Americans are Americans are Americans. That's the American Dream.

This is a dream shared by people who go back 14 generations in America, like my family does, or people who are brand-new arrivals in America, the newest person who just got their green card or just got their citizenship, sworn in and just got naturalized yesterday. The American Dream. This is the dream we are talking about.

Now, I believe that the conservatives in this body have another kind of dream. Their dream, based on the policies that they pursue, is to get the rights of workers away from them. They are all applauding what happened in Wisconsin so that in the workforce and workplace you have got no democracy; you have no say-so on what happens to you. They want to have us working for China wages. They want us competing with the people in the Third

World, and they want to drive wages down so that we can be price competitive with people who basically don't make anything.

They want to have a Tax Code that allows the richest of the richest to keep their money and not contribute to society, and push the expenses of society onto the working and middle class people. They envision a society where you have a tiny elite and a vast number of Americans who are desperate and will work for anything, because they will have gotten rid of the social safety net that we as a society come together and put in place. They want to get rid of LIHEAP, which is home heating oil; get rid of Pell Grants, which help our students from moderate and low incomes have a chance to get ahead; get rid of foreclosure mitigation programs so that Americans could try to keep their homes; get rid of all this stuff that helps people and just say, Yeah, you can work, but you had better work for whatever the big boss pays you, and you can't have a union. And if you are lucky enough to be among the top 1 percent, then life is going to be good.

This is the Progressive message. That is what we are here to talk about today, the American Dream. But the dream I am talking about is rooted in the Pledge of Allegiance.

I have got to confess to you, Mr. Speaker, I love coming here to say the Pledge of Allegiance. Whenever I am privileged enough to be able to be on the House Floor at 10 a.m. or 12, whenever we open, I always feel good about saying the Pledge of Allegiance. I teach it to my children, the Pledge of Allegiance. And my favorite part of it—and of course I love the whole thing. But my favorite part of it is when we say, "liberty and justice for all." I love that part of it. "For all."

Now see, the conservatives in this body, they like to talk about liberty. And then when they are talking about liberty, they are not talking about a woman's right to choose, because that is liberty. They are not talking about the freedom of worship to be Muslim, Christian, Jewish, Baha'i. No religion at all. They don't believe in that. They believe only one way to seek the Divine, and they get more radical with it every single day. They don't believe in liberties like that. They don't believe you should be able to say whatever you want to say. They don't necessarily believe in the liberties that I am talking about.

They believe in property rights. That's the liberty they are talking about. They mean that you ought to be able to own as much as you want. And if you can buy the whole State of Texas, Oklahoma or Minnesota and you have got the money for it, you ought to be able to do it. That is what they are talking about. They are talking about property.

Now, I believe in property rights, too. I am a very firm believer that you ought to own your home, you ought to

own your business. You ought to be able to have some things that are yours, and they are not for the government to control. I share that belief with them, not to the extreme they believe it, but I do believe that there is an important role for property rights. I also believe that there is a right for personal liberties, too, and they are not so hot about that.

But it seems like they end the whole discussion after "and justice for all." They are okay with the liberty part as long as it is property rights, but they are against the "and justice for all" because it is the "and justice," not "or justice." "And justice."

Justice has to do with treating people equally—all colors, all cultures, all faiths. Justice means that you marry who you want to marry in America. It is not the government's business. Justice means treating people with fairness. That is what it means. Justice in the economic sphere means that all of us have to share the burden of expense of this great country of ours and that none of us can reap all the goodies of being in America but don't have to pay anything when it comes to footing the bill. That is justice.

Now, this last part, in some ways, is the best part, "for all." For everyone. Last week, we had some hearings in the Homeland Security Committee where one particular religious group was pointed out for persecution, actually. That was a sad day. For all, though, America is about for all. For everybody. All Americans of whatever faith group, of whatever color, of whatever, rural or urban, straight, gay. All of us. Liberty and justice for all. It ought to make you feel good.

And when you think about liberty, this means you can do what you want to do. My conservative friends think it only means property, but it really means property or personal liberty. Justice means we treat people fairly in America. You have got a right to a fair trial. Even if you are accused of a crime, we can't take your liberty or your justice away or your money until it is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Justice.

We have the Fourth Amendment that says the government has to have a reasonable basis and has to get a warrant before they go snooping on you. That is justice. Justice, the right to a lawyer. These things are important. And we don't give up on justice. Even if you are a person accused of something really bad and it looks like you really did it, still you get justice in this America I love so much. And it is for all. Everybody. We have no exceptions.

It seems like some of my friends on the conservative side of this body would have "and liberty and justice for all except gays, Muslims, and immigrants." That is what it seems like their opinion is. That is how they behave anyway.

Anyway, I am just going to leave that up there for a moment because I am going to refer to it. But I want to

say, the fact is that Democrats aren't afraid to stand up for the middle class. We are not afraid to say that Americans, if you want, if you are ready to work hard, ought to be able to get a piece of that American Dream. If you are ready to study hard, we ought to do something to make sure that you can go to school and get a quality education. And the government, the American Government has a role, a certain responsibility to make sure that is there for you.

One of the big debates we are having in Congress now, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: On the one side, we have people on this side of the aisle, and they are under the impression that the government can't do anything for you, shouldn't do anything to help you out.

□ 1940

On the other side, we believe in mixed government. Yes, the government should be there for you, but you should be able to do—I mean, of course you have liberty and you have the private sector and the mixture with the public sector together. They say the private sector. We say private and public sector. This is the debate going on in Congress right now.

When I think about the things that we worked on today, they wanted to get rid of all the foreclosure mitigation programs. In America, 4 million foreclosures, and perhaps 7 million before it is all done, and we literally voted on the House floor today that all those people can just let the market deal with their problem. That is it.

Now, we didn't let the market deal with its problems when they came here and asked for \$700 billion for Wall Street. We didn't let the market deal with them. They get some socialism when they are in a jam.

But really, when that bailout happened to those banks and Republicans voted for it, Democrats too—I voted for it, full disclosure—what happened is we said, Look, you have been irresponsible. You have done the wrong thing. You are like a person who has been smoking cigarettes in bed. You are like a person who has been drinking and got busted, and you are in jail.

And like that person who smoked in bed, your house burned down. But I can't run out and lecture you about how smoking in bed is wrong. I have got to go get some water and put the fire out, because the fire you started can burn my house down if I don't do something.

And just like that friend who got drunk and was out, you call me up at 2 o'clock in the morning and say, Man, I am really wasted. Yes, I am going to tell you off and tell you how wrong you are, but I am going to get up out of bed, and I am going to pick you up because I don't want you to get in the car and hurt yourself or hurt somebody else.

So, yes, I voted for the bailout. I voted for the bailout because, if Wall Street went down, it was going to take all the rest of us with it.

But the point is, under the Bush administration, they asked us to step up, and they asked all of America. This is a representative democracy. We represent our districts. And they asked the American people, through us as their representatives, to say, Could you please help Wall Street out? They were very irresponsible, but if we don't help them, we are all going to suffer. So can you help them?

And the American people, through us, their representatives, came up with the majority that said, Okay, we will help. We don't want to go through this again. We want our money back. We have rules we are going to impose, but we are going to help. And today, guess what? We pretty much are going to get all that money back.

But when the American people needed a hand, as soon as the Republican caucus got in the majority, they started tearing down all the foreclosure mitigation programs. This is a sad day, and it is wrong. It is morally reprehensible, and I am sad they did it. I fought against it. I voted against it every time I could. But we go by the rules, and the rules are the majority decides. There is another election coming up, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, there are two things that should be pointed out about the Republican caucus. They say two things, two things that don't make much sense. Well, they say a lot of things that don't make much sense, but they say two things in particular. One is that they are fighting for jobs. They are not fighting for jobs, because if they were fighting for jobs, you would see them introduce at least one jobs bill. We have been here for 11 weeks. They have introduced exactly zero job bills. None.

I know people listening, Mr. Speaker, might think, well, maybe. I am sure they introduced at least one or two. No. Check it. None. They have introduced none. Absolutely none. They have introduced no bills for jobs. In fact, they introduced these spending cuts that are going to cut jobs.

We showed today the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which they cut and voted to eliminate today, offered 100,000 jobs across America. One of those people was looking forward to that job so they could put groceries on the table, pay their rent, take care of business. But we cut that program out, and they are all fine with that.

The budget they introduced, H.R. 1—that bill—experts, even conservative economists, say, will cut 700,000 jobs. They are not even embarrassed about it. It is amazing.

Then they also say we've got to cut it. We've got to cut it because—you know what?—We have got this enormous debt, and we don't want to put this debt—and they always say this, they always say this—on our children and grandchildren. They always say it. You know what they are about to say once they start saying it. We are broke. We can't put this debt on our children and grandchildren.

You know what? America is not broke. America is the biggest economy in the world. As a matter of fact, this economy is three times bigger than the Chinese economy. You wouldn't know that listening to them, because they are always running around like Chicken Little. Oh, my god, the sky is falling. The sky falling. America has got doom and gloom.

Well, I don't believe America is doom and gloom. I believe the best days of this country are yet to come. I think we have got to stop all this crying, and we have to understand that we have to grow ourselves out this deficit, not just cut everything so that we get rid of the social safety net that people rely on in order to climb up the ladder to the middle class. That is right, Mr. Speaker. We can't allow that to happen.

We have got to say that there are two things that Republicans say but are wrong. They are, one, not about jobs, because if they were, they would have introduced at least one jobs bill. They are not about cutting the deficit, because if they were, they wouldn't have forced President Obama into this bargain where they basically extended tax cuts for the richest, extended all of the tax cuts, which cost this country \$858 billion. And they forced him into that bargain all so that we could extend unemployment benefits for people who have been out of work because of Republican mismanagement of the economy.

This is the reality. They say they are about the deficit. When we try to do anything to get some more revenue in, they are against it. They want to extend tax cuts for the richest Americans, and they are letting \$858 billion go right out the door. If we had just let those tax cuts expire, it would have gone down to the rates when Bill Clinton was in office. And, do you know what? We had a booming economy then, because Democrats are just better at managing money than the Republicans are.

During the Bush years, we had slow job growth. We had very abysmal job growth. Middle class people had flat pay. We didn't have any increases. Of course, rich people had huge growth. They had precipitous growth in their income. It is amazing how much income the rich got during the Bush administration.

I will never forget that, at a big fundraiser that George Bush was having, he was talking to a body of people where there was an \$800 a plate dinner, and the President said, "Some people call you the elite. I call you my base." You know what? He wasn't lying when he said that, and he went into office and he took care of those people too.

So, they are not really about deficits, because if we didn't extend any of the tax cuts, we would eliminate the deficit in 4 years. I am for that. I will sign up for that. If we did not extend any of the tax cuts and if we let them all expire, the deficit would be wiped out in 4 years. But you know the Republicans

aren't serious about deficit reduction, so they would never do that.

So they are not serious about jobs. They are not serious about deficit reduction. I will tell you what they are serious about. They are absolutely serious about giving the richest Americans as much as they possibly can. That is what they are serious about. They are serious about giving the richest Americans as much as they can, and they are serious about taking and depriving lower income and working class Americans of a social safety net. They are serious about those two things, but they are not serious about jobs or deficit reduction.

But we in the Progressive Caucus are serious about liberty and justice for all. I really like this board, so I hate to take it down, but I will put it back up.

Now, I just said that the Republicans, conservatives, are absolutely not really about deficit reduction. They are really about cutting out the social safety net, cutting out aid for students, cutting out aid for poor people who need heat in our northern climates. They are for that kind of stuff. And they are for cutting out Head Start.

What they do is they extend these Bush tax cuts, and then they say, Oh, we don't have any money. And then they say the only way we can solve the deficit is through cuts. So you, grandma, you sonny boy who is in school, you little kid who is in Head Start, all of you guys are out of luck.

□ 1950

But that doesn't happen to some people.

Now here's a board, Mr. Speaker. And this board is what I call an interesting board. This board has on it Bank of America, General Electric, Citigroup, ExxonMobil, Wells Fargo. Mr. Speaker, in my pocket right now, I have \$25. That's what I've got in my pocket. I went to the ATM today because I need a little bit of money. That's all I got.

Mr. Speaker, I got more money in my pocket than all of these companies paid in taxes. Mr. Speaker, I got \$25 in my pocket, and it's \$25 more than Bank of America, General Electric, Citigroup, ExxonMobil, and Wells Fargo altogether paid in taxes. I need you to look this up, Mr. Speaker. I need you to investigate this. You might think, Oh, that's just a politician talking. I'm telling you. And I will back this up. They didn't pay any taxes.

And guess what? The Republican caucus is telling us that the students can't have any Pell Grants, that we can't afford a foreclosure mitigation program. They're telling us that we've got to cut Head Start, and we've got to cut home heating assistance. They're telling us that we've got to cut the basics that people rely on. We've got to cut research programs. We've got to cut programs that are going to help us investigate new scientific breakthroughs. But these guys don't want to pay. You don't want to pay anything?

Wait a minute, Bank of America. Wait a minute, GE. Aren't you guys proud to be American companies? Didn't you guys benefit from being here in the United States? Don't you feel good about being here in the United States of America, the greatest country in the world, where you're free to pursue profit all you want? All we want to do is ask you to do a little something for people who are still trying to climb the ladder. And, apparently, the Republicans say, Don't worry about it, guys. You don't have to pay anything. Oh, my goodness. This is really quite amazing.

Mr. Speaker, this board here is a challenge to all these companies and any other ones—the big ones that didn't pay any taxes. It's a challenge. It's a challenge to support tax policy to help America. It's a challenge to support the policy of "and liberty and justice for all." They benefit from being here. They're protected by our Nation's fighting men and women in our military. They're protected by local police. If any one of their members gets injured or hurt or sick on the job, the emergency medical services come to their rescue.

They drive their big trucks and probably put more wear and tear on our roads than the regular citizens do. They use as much water as anybody else, sometimes even pollute it. In their cafeterias, they rely on the meat that's going to be served to be inspected by our government agencies.

Yet they don't want to pay nothing. And the sad thing about it is they probably wouldn't mind paying, but the Republican caucus insists that they pay nothing. Look at it, Mr. Speaker. They didn't pay. But on April 15, me and you are going to pay. We're going to pay big time. But guess what? Those companies didn't pay.

Also, it's not just corporations. It's individuals. I have no problem with Mr. Trump. I'm sure he's a nice person. Doesn't really seem like it on television, but he probably is. That's probably just an act. And I'm sure Ms. Hilton is a nice person, too. I've got nothing against them personally at all. Nothing bad to say about them. But I don't think they need a tax break. I don't think they need a tax break. I think they should pay their fair shares. I think the billionaires should pay their fair share.

As we are in the middle of a mighty budget battle, Mr. Speaker, I think patriotic Americans should say, We need a progressive Tax Code that asks the most privileged of all of us to pony it up, too. If you're going to ask Mildred, who bangs it out nine hours a day at a diner on \$9 an hour for money for taxes; if you're going to ask teachers and cops, firefighters, and EMTs to bang it out and pay up on April 15, I think Donald Trump and Paris Hilton should pay up, too.

Now, I don't have any problem with these people. I hope nobody thinks that this is a personal attack on them. It's

not. It's just the statement that in all your houses that you own—both of them probably have many—somebody has got to heat them houses, somebody has got to protect those houses if somebody breaks in them. Somebody has got to come put the fire out should, heaven forbid, it should ever happen. The road has got to be built; the sewer lines have got to be maintained and put out there.

That's the government. That's our American Government. And I just think these good folks here ought to feel good about writing a check so that the cops and the teachers can stay on the job; so that the kids who need a Pell Grant can get it; so that the kids who are in Head Start can have a program; so that there can be home heating assistance for our seniors. I would just think that they would do that. And I hope that they do. Again, nothing personal.

Mr. Speaker, I've looked at the Republican program, and I've looked at it carefully. I ask myself about their program, and I say to myself, Mr. Speaker, you know what? I don't want to just say their program is this or that; I want to look at what their program is and see what is actually there. And then after we can see what is there, then we can determine what actually their program is.

We can't go by what they just say, because they say, Oh, we just want to take the debt off of our children and grandchildren. Oh, we just want to get rid of this debt, or we don't have any money. None of that is true. But what is true? I think it's important to really dig into what's actually true, and I think it's important for us to really try to figure out what their program is based on their behavior.

So what I have come up with is the plan for a Republican recession. This is their plan. They want a permanent tax break for billionaires at the expense of working families. I'm sure these billionaires are nice people. In fact, you don't see too many billionaires down here saying, Hey, I need more money, Keith. We hear the Republicans saying that, who are supposed to be elected by the people. Which people?

The second thing is put BP, British Petroleum, in charge of our energy policy because the last speaker got up, going on and on about BP. I would check the facts. But here's a fact that you don't need to check, but you should. Leaders in their caucus—leaders on the Energy and Commerce Committee and their caucus—accuse President Obama of doing a shakedown of BP when you have to clean up the oil spill in the gulf, and now we have Members attacking him. That's an interesting fact right there. I found that quite remarkable.

Anyway, put Goldman Sachs in charge of our economic policy. Put insurance companies between you and your doctor. They always are saying, Oh, government takeover. They want to repeal health care, the Affordable

Care Act, which will put you back at the whim of an insurance company bureaucrat. At least the government you can vote on. You can't vote on the insurance company. That's a privately held company.

Bonuses for CEOs who ship American jobs overseas. Privatize Social Security. Oh, yes, they did. Raise the retirement age. Gut Medicare. And some of them have even stood for repeal of the 14th Amendment and the 17th Amendment.

This is a Republican plan. This is what they stand for. This is what they're about. This is what they believe in. I think that they should be proud and come down here and claim it and say, Yeah, we are for the very rich. We're not for you working class people. Because that's their program. That's what they stand for.

□ 2000

The conservative position is to call for tax cuts and deregulation because they believe that will unleash the competitive economy. Tax cuts and deregulation resulted in the worst financial disaster since the Great Depression. But even though we've seen massive drops in home values, we've seen 8.9 percent unemployment, the longest unemployment since the Great Depression, even though we've seen so much economic devastation, they're back here right now calling for the same old thing. It's crazy, it's amazing, and it's actually quite scary.

But we stand for the American Dream. We stand for liberty and justice for all. Folks, unless you actually live by it, it's just words. You've got to put meaning into these words in order for them to really make a difference. Liberty and justice for all. Shared prosperity. Shared costs. Not just one or the other.

Bank of America, as I said, didn't pay a single penny in Federal income tax in 2009.

Despite receiving billions from the Federal Government every single year in taxpayer giveaways, Boeing didn't pay a dime in U.S. Federal corporate income tax in 2008, 2009 or 2010.

Citigroup, deferred income taxes for the third quarter in 2010, amounted to a grand total of zero. At the same time, Citigroup has continued to pay its staff lavishly. A gentleman by the name of John Havens, head of Citigroup's investment bank, is expected to be the bank's highest paid executive for the second year in a row. He got \$9.5 million. Citigroup is a big TARP recipient, by the way.

ExxonMobil, Big Oil tax dodgers, used offshore subsidiaries in the Caribbean to pay their fair share. Although ExxonMobil paid \$15 billion in taxes in 2009, not a single penny of it went to the American Treasury. This is the same year that the company overtook Wal-Mart in the Fortune 500. Meanwhile, total compensation of ExxonMobil's CEO was \$29 million.

General Electric, 2009, the world's largest corporation, filed more than

7,000 tax returns and still didn't pay anything to America's government. GE managed to do this with the aid of a rigged Tax Code that essentially subsidizes companies for losing money. With the aid of Republicans in Congress whose campaigns they financed, they exploit our Tax Code to avoid paying their fair share.

And who do Republicans blame? The middle class. Republicans blame public employees, who are really America's everyday heroes. Public employees are America's everyday heroes. Think about it. If somebody breaks into your house, who are you going to call? A public employee, who's going to help apprehend the people who stole your stuff, known as a police officer.

If your house starts burning, who are you going to call? A public employee, also known as a firefighter. If your kid wants to go to school, public school, who's staying after working on that algebra, working on that geometry, making sure that kid gets that lesson, who believes in that child's ability to learn. Who's doing that? Teachers.

Heaven forbid, you get a heart attack or a stroke and you need an emergency medical technician. Who's that? A public employee. These public employees, who have been viciously slandered in Wisconsin and in other places, they don't deserve that. They're hard-working people and they help us every single day. When we are running out of burning buildings, they are running into them, and I think they deserve better than what they've been getting. That goes for Federal employees, too. These are the people who inspect our water, who take care of our national forests and our parks. These are people who make our government run. I think they do a pretty good job.

In order for them to have a decent life, in order for them to do well, in order for them to be able to prosper—to hear the Republicans talk, you'd think that being a government employee, a public employee, a person who's an American hero, who takes care of us every single day, you'd think that they're just the ones living lavishly and getting too much. They've got nothing to say about these bonuses. You ever hear anything on the Republican side of the aisle talk about how it's ridiculous for the CEO of ExxonMobil to be making \$29 million a year? You don't hear that. You don't hear that.

But I think that it's time for those folks, those millionaires and billionaires, to start ponying up. That's why today I was happy to join JAN SCHAKOWSKY and several other Progressive Caucus members to introduce the Fairness in Taxation Act. During these times, millionaires and billionaires should be giving in charity, not getting charity. They should be giving in charity, not getting charity. The middle class is shrinking and deficits are rising because Republicans are giving a pass to the special interests who aren't paying their fair share. It's time to put

that money in the hands of people who work for a living. The Fairness in Taxation Act is part of a plan to level the playing field.

According to the NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll of March 2, 2011, with 81 percent of support, the most popular way to reduce the deficit is by placing a surtax on Federal income taxes for those who make more than a million a year. And if you don't think there's plenty of people who make more than a million a year, you'd be surprised to know that if we taxed them, it would raise about \$78 billion.

It's time for millionaires and billionaires to pay their fair share. The middle class is disappearing, and it's no accident. Over the last 30 years, there has been the most dramatic and deliberate redistribution of wealth from the middle class up to the millionaires and billionaires. Not since 1928, right before the Great Depression, has income inequality in this country been this ridiculous. Wages have stagnated for middle and lower income families, despite enormous gains in productivity, meaning that we're making more within the same amount of time, because they're working us harder and we're just doing more. We've got technology and we're just pretty good at what we do.

Where did the money go? Where did the extra money go? The money went to the richest 1 percent which owns 34 percent of the Nation's wealth, more than the entire bottom 90 percent who owns just 29 percent of the country's wealth. The top one-tenth of 1 percent, I'm talking about the richest of the rich, now makes an average of \$27 million per household. The average income for the bottom 90 percent of Americans is \$31,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people who tune into C-SPAN make \$31,000 a year. They have relatives and friends who make \$31,000 a year. You might be a brand new teacher making \$31,000 a year. You might be a brand new cop making \$31,000 a year. But the top one-hundredth of 1 percent makes \$27 million a year on average. They can't pay anything. They don't want to pay to help Head Start. They don't want to pay to help Pell Grants. It's a shame. I would think that they would pony up and want to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to say that it is always a pleasure to come before the House for the Special Order for the Progressive Caucus, but tonight I just want to leave one thought, and that one thought is liberty and justice for all. No exceptions. Everybody.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 1 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. LABRADOR (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of

the week on account of family medical reasons.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Shirley Ann Jackson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Stephen M. Case as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Robert P. Kogod as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 17, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

883. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notice that the Department is taking essential steps to award a Multi-Year Procurement (MYP) contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

884. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's annual report for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Financial Services.

885. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Ireland pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

886. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2010, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 13218; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

887. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a formal response to the GAO report GAO-11-124; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

888. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a formal response to the GAO report GAO-11-42SU; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

889. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-10, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

890. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter of

justification for the implementation of Cooperative Threat Reduction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

891. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2010 through November 30, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

892. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

893. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Sturgis, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0992; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-36] received February 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

894. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Limiting the Use of Electronic Devices by Highway [Docket No.: PHMSA-2010-0221 (HM-256)] (RIN: 2137-AE63) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

895. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Mechanical Fitting Failure Reporting Requirements [Docket No.: PHMSA-RSPA-2004-19854, Amdt. Nos. 191-22; Amdt. 192-116] (RIN: 2137-AB60) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

896. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class B Airspace; Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0514; Airspace Docket No. 07-AWA-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

897. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Muncie, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1032; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-20] received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

898. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Martinsville, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1031; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-19] received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

899. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Savoonga, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1103; Airspace Docket No. 10-AAL-18] received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

900. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Shungnak, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1104; Airspace Docket No. 10-AAL-19] received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

901. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Barrow, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0722; Airspace Docket No. 10-AAL-17] received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

902. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Platinum, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1105; Airspace Docket No. 10-AAL-20] received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MICA: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Supplemental report on H.R. 658. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-29, Pt. 2).

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 174. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content (Rept. 112-35). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1109. A bill to raise achievement in international education in elementary schools and secondary schools through grants to improve teacher competency and to support programs in international education that supplement core curricula in such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1110. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the maximum monthly rate for the military special pay known as hostile fire pay, imminent danger pay, or hazardous duty pay, to increase the maximum monthly rate for the family separation allowance paid to deployed members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FLORES, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LONG, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1111. A bill to rescind \$45 billion of unobligated discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DOLD, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. JONES, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1112. A bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1113. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of unemployment status; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1114. A bill to establish an employment-based immigrant visa for alien entrepreneurs who have received significant capital from investors to establish a business in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. CANSECO):

H.R. 1115. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to establish a deadline and other requirements for issuance of drilling permits under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr.

LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1116. A bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 1117. A bill to recognize and clarify the authority of the States to regulate the medical aspects of intrastate air ambulance services pursuant to their authority over health care services, patient safety and protection, emergency medical care, the quality and coordination of medical care, and the practice of medicine within their jurisdictions; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1118. A bill to establish a point of order against any efforts to reduce benefits paid to Social Security recipients, raise the retirement age, or create private retirement accounts under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OLVER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1119. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the position of National Nurse for Public Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 1120. A bill to require a site operator of an international travel Web site to provide information on its Web site to consumers regarding the potential health and safety risks associated with overseas vacation destinations marketed on its Web site; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. YODER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 1121. A bill to replace the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protec-

tion with a five person Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1122. A bill to provide for merit-based investment in the freight transportation system of the United States to ensure economic growth, increase vitality and competitiveness in national and global markets, address goods mobility and accessibility issues, reduce air pollution and other environmental impacts of freight transportation, better public health conditions, enhance energy security, and improve the condition and connectivity of the freight transportation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1123. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to revise certain infrastructure finance provisions; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr.

GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose increased rates of tax with respect to taxpayers with more than \$1,000,000 taxable income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1125. A bill to establish a fee on transactions which would eliminate the national debt and replace the income tax on individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. FLAKE):

H.R. 1126. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain Federal lands in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, previously identified as suitable for disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1127. A bill to encourage and ensure the use of safe football helmets and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. RICHARDSON (for herself, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BACA, Mr. SABLON, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1128. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a competitive program to make emergency preparedness planning and implementation grants to local educational agencies and districts located in areas under a high threat of terrorist attacks, natural disasters, or public health emergencies; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. RICHARDSON (for herself, Ms. BASS of California, and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 1129. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to prohibit requiring the use of a specified percentage of a grant under the Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program for specific purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1130. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide authority for certain members of the Armed Forces who have served 20 years on active duty to transfer entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1131. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide grants to State and local governments to carry out programs to provide mediation between mortgagees and mortgagors facing foreclosure; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WU, and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 1132. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to establish a grant program to improve the ability of trauma center hospitals and airports to withstand earthquakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1133. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into agreements with States and nonprofit organizations to collaborate in the provision of case management services associated with certain supported housing programs for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. JONES, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 1134. A bill to amend section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deny assistance under such section to a State or political subdivision of a State that prohibits its officials from taking certain actions with respect to immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 1135. A bill to provide information on total spending on means-tested welfare programs, to provide additional work requirements, and to provide an overall spending limit on means-tested welfare programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, the Budget, Rules, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. DICKS):

H.R. 1136. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to create the

National Office for Cyberspace, to revise requirements relating to Federal information security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1137. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide coverage under such Act for credit cards issued to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 1138. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a grant program to fund additional school social workers and retain school social workers already employed in high-need local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that tips shall not be subject to income or employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WEST, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 1140. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal taxes on the income of senior citizens and to improve income security of senior citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 1141. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WEST (for himself, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. NUGENT, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. KISSELL, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1142. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure the equitable treatment of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who are killed or wounded in an attack, occurring outside of a combat zone, that targeted the members or employees on account of their status as members of the Armed Forces or civilian employees of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1143. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to require delivery by United States mail of any transportation security card issued to an individual who resides in a remote location; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. GOHMERT):

H. Res. 173. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any bill or joint resolution that appropriates foreign assistance for more than one country; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Res. 175. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that in order to continue aggressive growth in the Nation's telecommunications and technology industries, the United States Government should "Get Out of the Way and Stay Out of the Way"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1109.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 1110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I whereby Congress is given the authority to appropriate moneys in the Treasury.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which reads: To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 1115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and Section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 1117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is authorized under the Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, restoring power to regulate medical services to the States.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 1121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sixteenth Amendment: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which states the Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 which says "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16 which says "To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States."

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Article 1, Section 8, which grants Congress the authority to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States and Clause 18 of Article 1, Section 8, which allows the authority to make laws deemed necessary and proper.

By Mr. JORDAN:

H.R. 1135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the

United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, of Section 8, of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 1138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes"

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; The 16th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SABLON:

H.R. 1141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. WEST:

H.R. 1142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers."

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 58: Mr. MICA, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. WEBSTER.

H.R. 100: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 114: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 118: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 122: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 124: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 136: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 153: Mrs. ADAMS.

H.R. 172: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 178: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 181: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 186: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 187: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 213: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 282: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 303: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 324: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 361: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 376: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 440: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 481: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 497: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 498: Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 520: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 521: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 535: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 539: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 546: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HIMES, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 567: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 610: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 615: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. CANSECO.
 H.R. 625: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 645: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WEST, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. MICA.
 H.R. 657: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 676: Ms. BASS of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 713: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 714: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 715: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 716: Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 733: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 750: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 758: Mr. DENHAM.
 H.R. 763: Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
 H.R. 764: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 776: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 790: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 795: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 801: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 820: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 822: Mr. DENT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 831: Mr. JONES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 840: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 862: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 872: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 875: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 878: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 895: Mr. POLIS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 900: Mr. PETERS and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 909: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 910: Mr. PENCE and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 912: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 930: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 931: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 949: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 951: Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 967: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 977: Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 990: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 998: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 999: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 1000: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 1002: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BACA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 1016: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1044: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 1046: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 1057: Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1058: Mr. LATTA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 1062: Mr. POSEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DOLD, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. GRIMM.
 H.R. 1065: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 1075: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1081: Mr. SIRES, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1085: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BERMAN.
 H.J. Res. 13: Ms. FOXX and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.J. Res. 42: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. YODER, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. PAUL.
 H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. SIRES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H. Con. Res. 13: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HALL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. RIGELL.
 H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. NADLER.
 H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. ROYCE.
 H. Res. 25: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H. Res. 60: Mr. RUSH, Mr. KINGSTON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H. Res. 86: Mr. DENT.
 H. Res. 102: Mr. RIVERA.
 H. Res. 130: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. BECERRA.
 H. Res. 134: Mr. OLVER.
 H. Res. 137: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARDOZA, and Ms. HIRONO.
 H. Res. 140: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
 H. Res. 164: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. GOWDY.
 H. Res. 172: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. MARKEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

H.R. 1076, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of federal funds to acquire radio content, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 rule XXI.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 979: Mr. CLAY.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2011

No. 40

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Creator God, alert our senses to Your world. Let sight and sound, taste and touch remind us that You are sovereign and in control of the unfolding events of our planet.

Give our lawmakers the desire to do Your will. Equip them with deeper insight and loftier courage, enabling them to act not only for today but for the coming hour of Your Kingdom. Keep their idealism and dreams of a better world from being crushed by disappointment, doubts, and despair. Show them the way of servanthood, which sanctifies every task done for Your glory. We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUE).

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the second half.

Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 493, the Small Business jobs bill.

Senators should expect two rollcall votes at about 10:30 this morning. Those votes will be in relation to the following amendments: Nelson of Nebraska, regarding a sense-of-the-Senate resolution to reduce the Senate's budget by 5 percent, and a Snowe-Landrieu-Coburn amendment striking the Federal authorization of the National Veterans Business Development Program.

Additional rollcall votes in relation to amendments to the Small Business bill are expected during today's session of the Senate.

At 12 noon, Senator BLUMENTHAL, from Connecticut, will deliver his maiden speech and will speak for up to 20 minutes.

Yesterday, we received a 3-week continuing resolution from the House. I hope we will be able to reach an agreement to consider that before the end of the week.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—H.J. RES. 48

Mr. REID. Madam President, I am told that H.J. Res. 48 is at the desk and due for its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 48) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE COOPERATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, no one can count the number of times this Chamber has heard calls for compromise. That call has come from Senators of good faith, from Senators on both sides. Indeed, it is the very essence of the legislative branch, which was purposefully designed to run on consensus by our Founding Fathers.

As Senators we search for the right arguments, and the right incentives that will help us strike the right balance—a balance that will let the Senate and the country move forward. But there has been no stronger argument for bipartisanship than the series of budget votes over the past few days.

Last week, the Senate voted on two proposals—one written by Republicans and one written by Democrats. Some Republicans voted against the Republican bill and some Democrats voted against the Democratic bill. In the end, neither passed.

Yesterday, the House voted on another Republican proposal. Again, some Republicans voted against their own party's plan—a lot of them did—and some Democrats voted for the

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1709

other party's plan. This time, it passed—but only because it had bipartisan support. We don't know what will happen when that same question comes before the Senate this week, but we know we won't see a strictly party-line vote.

The lesson is obvious: Neither party can pass a bill without the other party, and neither Chamber can send that bill to the President without the other Chamber. Therefore, if you're looking for a case study on why cooperation is necessary, that is as clear as it comes.

It is just as obvious that we cannot meet in the middle if one side refuses to give any ground. Both parties and both Houses must be willing to work together. We cannot negotiate without a partner on the other side of the table. We will not find a solution in stubbornness.

I will repeat the request I have made since the beginning of the budget debate. It is a request for reasonableness. It is the same call for compromise and consensus that has always kept this diverse Nation moving forward. It is the same appeal made by one of the great Senators in the history of this country—a Senator whose seat the Republican leader now holds. Kentucky's Henry Clay said:

All legislation is founded upon the principle of mutual concession.

If the Senate and House cannot pass a long-term budget that keeps the country open for business, another reality will be made very plain for the American people to see. It will be crystal clear which party was willing to work toward a common goal and which party lacked the courage to compromise.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders, or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half of the time, and the Republicans controlling the final half.

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I take this time to reflect with my colleagues and say that we celebrate today the 1-year anniversary of the passage of the Affordable Care Act, and to reflect how much happened to improve health care in America since the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

We have reason to celebrate. If you are a senior in the Medicare Program, and you now know that you can see your primary care doctor every year for an annual wellness exam, and that wellness exam will now be covered under Medicare, and you will have an opportunity to meet with your doctor and take charge of your own health, you have a reason to celebrate passage of the Affordable Care Act.

If you are a senior who happens to fall within the coverage gap under the prescription drug benefits in Medicare, the so-called doughnut hole, and you have been forced at times to leave prescriptions on the counter of a drugstore because you could not afford to pay the cost of the prescription, and you now know that there is coverage in Medicare if you fall within that gap—for last year, 3.2 million seniors who fell within the gap received a \$250 check. This year, the seniors who fall within this coverage gap will receive a 50-percent discount on their brandname drugs. Next year, their benefit will be worth as much as \$2,400 and, by 2020, we will close the gap entirely, all as a result of the passage of the Affordable Care Act. So you have reason to celebrate that Congress finally got the job done.

If you are an American family, like many, and you celebrate your child's graduation from college, only to find that your child could no longer be covered under your health insurance policy because of the age restriction, and now you learn that Congress has changed that age to 26, so you can keep your youngster under your family insurance program, and that child now has health insurance, and you are one of 1.2 million people who benefit from this provision that was in the Affordable Care Act, you have reason to celebrate the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

If you are a small business owner who can now afford to cover your employees because of the small business tax credit that was included in the Affordable Care Act—4 million eligible institutions will be eligible for that tax credit, and soon you will be able to get competitive rates. Small businesses today pay 20 percent more for the same coverage large companies have. Congress took action last year to eliminate that disparity. If you are one of those small business owners now benefiting from that tax credit or who will benefit from more competitive rates and better choice, you have reason to celebrate the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

If you happen to be a consumer of health insurance, as almost all of us are, and you want value for your premium dollar, you now know that with passage of the Affordable Care Act, the lion's share of your health premiums must go for health benefits, reining in the excessive administrative costs of private insurance companies, and you know now that Congress has taken action to prevent the abusive practices of

private insurance companies, you have reason to celebrate the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

If you happen to be the woman in Maryland, who was hiking in the mountains of West Virginia and fell off a cliff, was unconscious, and was flown to the closest emergency room to receive care and was denied coverage because she did not call ahead for preauthorization, you have a reason to celebrate the enactment of the Affordable Care Act.

Yes, insurance companies have denied coverage for emergency care because of requirements for preauthorization or have denied coverage because the ultimate diagnosis did not meet their standard for reimbursement, even though your symptoms indicated you should seek emergency care. I started working on that issue in 1995, known as the prudent layperson's standards for requiring insurance companies to reimburse their policyholders for visits to emergency rooms, where their symptoms indicated they should go to the emergency room.

In 1997, Medicare and Medicaid were changed in order to provide for the prudent layperson's standard for reimbursement. Now all insurance companies must comply with that standard because of the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

If you are a parent who has a child who has asthma or you have been told that the insurance company won't provide full coverage because of your child's preexisting condition, and now you can get full coverage for your child, you too have a reason to celebrate the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

If you are an adult and have been told you cannot get insurance because of a preexisting condition, such as high blood pressure, or you happen to be like a couple from Montgomery County, MD, who had to get two separate insurance policies because of preexisting conditions, paying two separate premiums and two separate deductibles, and now you know you can get one insurance plan that will cover your family, you have a reason to celebrate, because that too was corrected by the Affordable Care Act that was passed by Congress 1 year ago.

If you happen to be a taxpayer who is concerned about the fiscal soundness of Medicare or the budget deficit, you too have a reason to celebrate enactment of the Affordable Care Act, because the Affordable Care Act extended the solvency of the Medicare system by 12 years, putting it on a safer basis, making it less vulnerable for our budget.

The enactment of the Affordable Care Act reduced the Federal budget deficit by over \$100 billion during the first 10 years, and over \$1.5 trillion during the first 20 years. This is because, quite frankly, this bill manages illness much more cost effectively. It uses health information technology more effectively and it invests in wellness, and it brings down the cost. That is not what this

Senator is saying has been established; it is what the CBO has told us will bring in savings on our budget deficit. Taxpayers have a reason to celebrate the enactment of the Affordable Care Act.

There is one other reason to celebrate the year's anniversary of the enactment of this legislation. Let me give one more example. A couple of weeks ago I was at the Greater Baden Health Center located about 7 or 8 miles from where we are today. They are doing something about the infant mortality rate in our community. We have too high of an infant mortality rate because of low birth weight babies. Some do not survive and become part of our infant mortality numbers in America where we are much higher than we should be. Others survive and have complications that need to be addressed by our health care system, making it challenging for the infant and expensive for our society.

At the Greater Baden Health Center, they are doing something about that situation. They are expanding their qualified health center to include prenatal care so pregnant women can get the type of attention they need to have healthy babies. That money comes from the Affordable Care Act because of the expansion of our qualified health centers.

We all celebrate what we are able to accomplish. It will keep our children healthier and save us money and have less use of the emergency rooms by expanding care at our qualified centers.

Madam President, if you are concerned about health disparities in America—and you have reason to be—minorities are two times more likely to suffer from diabetes and 33 percent more likely to die from heart disease. In the African-American community, the infant mortality rate is 2.3 times higher than the White community. When we look at the number of people who have access to health care and health insurance, the minority population represents one-third. Yet they are one-half of the people who do not have health insurance.

I think we all agree that we need to do something about that situation. That is not right in our sense of fairness. But let me give one more reason it will save us money.

A study done at Johns Hopkins University and the University of Maryland points out that we can save \$260 billion in excess direct medical care costs if we can deal with the minority health disparities. We had done something about that in the Affordable Care Act. An amendment that I was proud to offer established the Institute for Minority Health and Health Disparities within the National Institutes of Health. We have developed minority health and disparity offices in each of our agencies that deal with health care to do something about health disparities in America. We can all celebrate that we are able to move that forward in the Affordable Care Act.

We should all take pride that America at long last, after decades of unsuccessful attempts, has acted. Health care is a right, not a privilege. As our dear friend, the late Senator Kennedy, said: We no longer have a sick care system. We have taken action to include all under health care in America.

I understand the Republicans in the House want to repeal each and every one of these improvements and accomplishments. They offer no hope of taking up these issues in a serious manner during this Congress. Speaking on behalf of our seniors, speaking on behalf of our small business owners, speaking on behalf of the consumers of health insurance in America, speaking on behalf of what is right, as far as covering and making sure everyone has access to affordable care, we do not want to see that happen. We do not want to move backwards. We have reason to celebrate the accomplishments of moving forward with health care. We want to move forward, not back, and continue to build on an American health care system that provides affordable quality care to all Americans.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

GAS PRICES ON THE RISE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the rising cost of gasoline has become a major source of concern for most Americans. With prices in most States moving closer and closer to \$4 a gallon, and already higher in some areas, America has a right to know where the President and Democrats in Congress stand on the issue.

Let me begin this morning with a simple observation that it is no accident gas prices are skyrocketing at a time when Democrats control two-thirds of official Washington. It is no secret Democratic leaders in Washington do not particularly care for this issue. Ask them about gas prices and chances are they will tell you about some car they plan to build and have ready for production about 25 years down the road. Suggest we tap some of our domestic sources of oil and they will give you 101 reasons we cannot and how that is not a real solution anyway because it will take too long to get it out of the ground.

We have been having that particular argument for decades now—literally

for decades. Then they have the audacity to step in front of the cameras and tell us they are all for reducing our dependence on foreign sources of oil. With what—windmills?

It is time to be serious about a serious problem. The fact is, there is no reason in the world we cannot invest in future technologies at the same time we are tapping into the resources we already have right here at home and creating jobs while we do it. But Democrats do not seem to like that idea. They would rather force a change in behavior now than giving struggling American families the relief they need from the rising gas prices.

Do not listen to what they say on the issue, watch what they do. Here is what they have done.

Over the past 2 years, the Obama administration has delayed, revoked, suspended, or canceled an enormous range of development opportunities.

One month after the President took office, his administration canceled 77 oil and gas leases in Utah. Once the review was complete, the administration refused to reinstate even a single one.

A month after that, the administration shortened lease terms for offshore oil and gas production and raised fees for permit applications.

Last January, it announced new restrictions for onshore oil and gas exploration in the mountain West.

Last February, it denied a permit to build a bridge needed to access an oil-producing field in Alaska, after the Environmental Protection Agency designated a nearby river an aquatic resource of national importance.

Last April, the administration suspended 61 oil and gas leases in Montana that were issued in 2008 and then announced that all oil and gas leases in Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota would be delayed indefinitely.

Last May, the President announced a 6-month moratorium on deepwater drilling—a moratorium that has been repeatedly struck down in the courts.

The list of actions such as these go on and on, and that is to say nothing of the proposed new Environmental Protection Agency regulations on energy that would either cause oil refineries to pass along their resulting new production costs to consumers at the pump or drive them and their jobs overseas.

Let there be no doubt, the efforts of the White House are costing jobs and putting even more pressure on gas prices. Paying lip service to the public's concerns will not solve the problem. Unlocking our own sources of energy at home would help immensely.

Just to give an idea of the kind of resources we have right here at home, consider that just one 2,000-acre section of the nonwilderness sections of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, along with the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, have enough recoverable oil to replace crude imports from the Persian Gulf for nearly 65 years—65 years.

The problem is not that we need to look elsewhere for energy. The problem

is that Democrats in Washington will not let us use it. The problem is that even with gas prices on the rise, they want to tax it even more.

Let's make this simple. I am going to propose just two concrete practical things we can do in Washington to give the American people some relief, create jobs, and help us be less dependent on foreign sources of oil, two ideas that would have wide bipartisan support. Let's increase American energy production, and let's block any new regulations that will drive up the production costs for energy. These are two ideas that will create jobs and alleviate the increasing pressure on gas prices.

Let's leave the ideology aside and do some practical good for Americans who are struggling out there. Let's increase American production of energy with American jobs and stop the job-stifling regulations.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, we are all facing the challenge of gasoline prices adding a new burden to family budgeting as well as small businesses and large businesses alike. It couldn't come at a worse time, in light of our recession and unemployment. But it is important for us to put into perspective where we are and how we should resolve this issue.

When we look at the entire known reserves of oil and gas in the world—in the entire world—the United States has 3 percent—3 percent—and each year the United States consumes 25 percent of the energy that is used in the world. So when I hear my colleagues on the other side come to the floor and say we can drill our way out of this, I say to them: That is unrealistic and doesn't reflect the reality of what we face today.

Yes, we should have responsible drilling for oil and gas. We should be sensitive to the environment to avoid the kind of hazards and accidents we saw in the Gulf of Mexico, to protect that part of America and part of the world we believe should be preserved for future generations. But the notion if we could start drilling more our problems would go away is not only naive, it is wrong—flatout wrong.

We heard the chants of “drill, baby, drill” a year and a half ago in the course of a Presidential campaign. It is not the answer to America's energy policy, ever. We still import \$1 billion worth of oil a day into the United States. It is an indication of our dependence on foreign oil that any inter-

ruption in the Middle East or from other sources is going to raise our prices.

What should we do about it? Several things. First, on the immediate agenda, we should look at the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The President has to decide—and said Friday he was considering—on releasing oil we have saved in this reserve to bring down prices and keep the economy moving forward. I support that. I hope the President will do that.

Secondly, we have to look at ways that the current oil pricing is being gamed by some financiers and speculators. From my point of view, this is something that needs to be not only examined but stopped. This speculation in oil prices runs up prices way too high, way too fast.

Third, take a look at the oil companies themselves. The top five oil companies are extremely profitable and, in the midst of crises, they make even more money. That is the reality.

Then, we need to step back and look at our national energy policy. How do we encourage the use of more efficient cars and trucks? Well, we don't do it by entertaining the amendment by the Republican leader in the Senate. He says the Environmental Protection Agency should step back from even encouraging the kind of fuel efficiency in cars and trucks which reduce our dependence on foreign oil and reduce pollution in the atmosphere. That is a step backward to the past. It is a rejection of basic science.

So when the Republican leader comes to the floor and gives his prescription for today's energy challenge in America, I would say to him: The patient is not going to get well. Senator, with your prescription. We have to have a coordinated energy policy moving toward fuel efficiency, reducing the use of energy, and still fueling our economy with renewable and sustainable sources of energy that don't pollute the atmosphere.

The Senator from Kentucky, who was giving us a speech this morning about energy, actually has an amendment he is preparing for the floor which removes the right of the Environmental Protection Agency to even deal with greenhouse gas emissions as they affect climate change and the world we live in. That is a stick-your-head-in-the-sand approach to an issue which future generations will look back on and say: What were they thinking; that they would ignore the reality of climate change in the world and the reality of what pollution is doing to our lungs, our health, our future. It is a reality that is being rejected by the Republican side of the aisle.

Madam President, I ask how much time is remaining in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Four minutes on the majority side.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair.

ANNIVERSARY OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this is the 1-year anniversary of the President's signing of health care reform, and I am happy to stand and say it represents one of the most important pieces of legislation in decades. For too long, we let our Nation's health care crisis grow and ignored it. People who said let the market work its will, have to be honest about what the market did. The market started excluding people who had preexisting conditions—and who among us doesn't? The market started charging higher and higher prices for health insurance. The market, unfortunately, was uncontrollable.

We tried to deal with it, to bring pricing under control and deal with the realities families face across America. When I was in the most heated debate about the health care bill with tea party devotees in front of my office in Springfield, I told them: Let me tell you about some of the people in Illinois I have met. At some point, the tea party people said: Stop telling stories, DURBIN. We don't want to hear any more stories. Of course, they don't because those stories are the reason we did this. Those stories represent real lives.

Let me tell one of those stories, representing a family who comes from East Peoria, IL. This is Jill and Ric Lathrop. They have two sons, Sam and Nat. One of them has a Superman t-shirt on. They are 12 and 14 years old and they have severe hemophilia. It is a rare and costly medical condition.

Thanks to the twice-weekly injections of blood clotting replacement factor they receive, the boys are able to live happy and healthy lives—and they look pretty darn good in that picture. That lifesaving medication costs roughly \$250,000 per child, per year.

For years, the family has lived in fear they would reach the lifetime limit of their insurance plan. That was a reality. Many of these plans had a ceiling that paid no more beyond a certain amount. Well, it happened to them in 2005. The hospital where Ric works as an MRI technician instituted a \$2 million lifetime cap on benefits. For most families, that wouldn't even be an issue, but for the Lathrops, who know their annual medical expenses will always total hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep their boys alive, that was devastating.

Rather than waiting for their benefits to run out, the Lathrops moved to Peoria, where Ric found a job that provided insurance without lifetime limits. He moved his family and found a job to get an insurance policy that would keep their boys alive. When the open enrollment period for their health insurance plan rolled around, they waited on edge to see if their insurance would, once again, institute an annual or lifetime limit on care that would force them to move again to ensure adequate coverage for their sons.

Thanks to the bill we passed last year, insurance companies can no

longer place lifetime limits on care. Think about what that means to this family who picked up and moved and looked for a new job to get health insurance to keep their boys alive. Is that what America should be? I think not.

Let me be very blunt about this. As good as this law was, it was not perfect. There are things that need to be addressed, examined, and changed. I have said before, and say again, the only perfect law was written on stone tablets and carried down a mountain by "Senator Moses." Everybody else has been trying and hasn't quite hit that standard. So let's be humble about this and be open to change. But let's not repeat this, as the Republicans have called for time and again. Let's not say to the Lathrop family: Sorry. You are on your own if another lifetime limit comes along that may literally endanger the lives of these two beautiful little blue-eyed boys.

That is what this debate is about. It is a story about a real family. That is why the other side hates to hear these stories, because the stories literally explain why stepping backward in time and repealing health care is exactly the wrong course for America.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, we are just about 1 year to the day from the day the President signed into law the health care law that is going to have an impact on all the people of this country. Here we are, 1 year later and we know a lot more about this law and people all around the country know a lot more about this law.

I spent part of the weekend visiting folks in Buffalo, WY, attending the Buffalo health fair. A health fair is a place in the community where people get together and get their blood tested ahead of time. It is very inexpensive. It is based on prevention and early detection—issues this health care law was supposed to address but has failed miserably at. At the health fair, I talked to people who were getting their blood results back, checking their cholesterol, checking their blood sugars to see about diabetes, checking their thyroid levels, and as these people were getting their blood tested—and many people, probably half the population of Buffalo, turned out to have their blood tested—they started asking me questions about the health care law, the kind of questions any American would be concerned about: Am I going to lose

my freedoms? Am I still going to be able to keep my doctor? Will it truly get the cost of care down?

Regrettably, this health care law, now 1 year since it has been signed, turns out to actually be bad for patients, bad for providers—the nurses and the doctors who take care of those patients—and bad for the taxpayers, the people left footing the bill because we know a lot more now, 1 year after the law was passed, than we did when it was passed.

People remember this as the law that was crammed through the Senate in the dead of night, written behind closed doors, and all the unseemly bargains that were cut to convince Senators to vote for it, getting by on the barest number of votes. There were things such as the cornhusker kickback, the Louisiana purchase—the sort of things that offended people all across this country. So people are upset with this health care law, No. 1, in the way it was passed: In spite of the fact the President promised it would be seen on C-SPAN, all the discussions were held behind closed doors and despite the fact that many Americans never had a chance to read this 2,700-page law.

When the President made his initial speech about what he was aiming to accomplish in health care reform, I said that would be great. I am an orthopedic surgeon, practiced medicine for 25 years, and I think we need to do the sorts of things the President initially addressed. Unfortunately, the health care law went in the opposite direction. When people worked their way through the 2,700-page bill, they found that instead of lowering the cost of care, the cost of their care was going to go up; instead of allowing people to keep the doctor they wanted, they were going to, unfortunately, have to change that situation. That is why I have been coming to the floor week after week with a doctor's second opinion about this health care law.

So here we are, 1 year later. We know the cost of health care is going up. The President said health care premiums would be lower for families by \$2,500. No family has seen that—or none that I know of; certainly none I have talked to in Wyoming, not one. Instead, people have seen the cost of their health insurance going up, not down.

The President said he was never going to raise taxes. It turns out, in fact, there are a lot of tax increases as part of this health care law. Even the 1099 form Senator JOHANNES has championed on the part of small businesses around the country, the efforts to remove these onerous obligations on our small businesses, have nothing to do with health care. That got crammed into this bill in the dead of night so those who support the bill can claim it was going to lower the cost. Even the Congressional Budget Office admits costs are going up, not down, and this is absolutely impacting jobs.

The President promised there would be efforts for small businesses to have

some advantages and some tax credits and some help, but what we found out is that if you have a small business with 10 employees and that number climbs to 11, you are going to lose some of those benefits. If you are paying your employees an average of over \$25,000 a year and you want to give them a raise, you start losing some of the benefits. So in spite of the fact the President had 4 million postcards sent out to small business owners, very few of them have been able to take advantage of what was promised to them.

Now here we are where additional waivers are being given. We are at a point where over 2.5 million Americans have been given waivers from participating in the health care law. Interestingly enough, these are the very people, for the most part—a significant number—who lobbied for the bill. Once they found out what was in it, they said no, I don't want this to apply to me. Now we see that the State of Maine, the entire State of Maine, has been given a waiver.

I come to the floor today, a year after this has passed into law, and I say everybody in the country ought to be able to get a waiver and opt out of this health care law, opt out completely. These are decisions that should be made at the State level, at the local level. Washington's "one size fits all" has hardly ever worked for anything and it surely does not work for health care.

In Wyoming, at the Wyoming Health Fair in Buffalo, as I visited with people and talked to them, do you know what they are worried about? They are worried about losing their freedoms, losing their choice, losing their doctor, losing the health care plan they like. In spite of the President's promises, we know that about 80 percent of people who get their health insurance through small businesses are not going to be able to keep the health care they like. Why? Because of government mandates. Government has said we know what is best for you. You do not, we do. The government says: We know what is best for your family. Government doesn't know what is best. These ought to be local decisions. That is why Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I and a number of other cosponsors have introduced legislation to allow States to opt out of this health care law, opt out of the individual mandate, the requirement that forces Americans to buy government-approved insurance.

Let States make that decision if people in their own State need to live under those laws. Let States decide if the employers, the people who are the job creators in our communities, if they have to supply government-approved insurance to the people who live there. Let people make decisions at the local level.

You can lift any newspaper and look at what the Medicaid mandates are doing to our States and the budgets of the States. States such as Wyoming, where we balance our budgets every

year and live within our means, are being crushed by these Medicaid mandates. But it is not just small States such as Wyoming, in terms of population—California, New York, States all across the country are saying to this body: Let us out, let us opt out. We cannot live under these mandates.

The President's solution is to cram more people onto Medicaid, a program that doesn't work, where many doctors will not see these patients, where the reimbursements are so low hospitals say we cannot afford to see these patients because of the impact it will have. Even the actuaries, the people who look at this in the fair and appropriate way to look at the numbers, say 15 percent of the hospitals in this country 10 years from now may not be able to be open because of the way this health care law is going. That is not going to provide more access. It is providing less access.

Why have seniors rejected this so overwhelmingly? Seniors have looked at this and they see \$500 billion in Medicare cuts, in things such as Medicare Advantage. There is an advantage to being in that program. That is why one out of four seniors has set up that program and chosen that program. It is because they want choice.

This health care law is one that is taking choice out of the hands of the American families, taking freedom out of the hands of the American families. Something I continue to hear from the people in Wyoming and across the country: We need to repeal and replace with commonsense solutions to allow people to buy insurance across State lines, make it legal to do that; to allow small businesses to pool their resources; to give incentives to individuals who go to something like the Wyoming Health Fair; and work on prevention and early detection of problems. Give those people the opportunity to make individual choices. Expand health savings accounts. Those are the sorts of things we can deal with in a responsible way to help American families get the care they want from the doctor they need at a price they can afford.

That is all the American people are asking for: the care they need from the doctor they want at a price they can afford. They are not getting it under this health care law. It has now been enacted for a full year. The American people know the truth.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNES. Madam President, I rise today to also speak about the health care bill.

The first anniversary of a new law should be a time to celebrate good policy, one would think. The mood surrounding the new health care law is much different. One year later, Americans are demanding as loudly as ever that we repeal it. That is not surprising, considering the almost constant flow of bad news, broken prom-

ises, higher costs, and sky-rocketing health insurance premiums.

We did not need a year of bad news and broken promises to know this new law was bad policy. It was fraught with problems even before it hit the Senate floor. Many of us pointed out the inevitable problems within this legislation. We warned how this law was predicated on faulty accounting that would exacerbate our current and future fiscal problems.

It is simply irresponsible and shortsighted to argue that legislation will reduce the debt when it is filled with budget gimmicks. But that is exactly what Congress did when passing this legislation, and we are paying the price.

The administration now admits that the funding elements of this law do not add up. For example, in testimony before the Finance Committee, HHS Secretary Sebelius described the newly created CLASS Act entitlement as "totally unsustainable." Furthermore, in recent congressional testimony, Secretary Sebelius was asked whether the Medicare cuts in the law are used to save Medicare or pay for the health care law. Remarkably, she responded "both." Even a young child knows you can't spend a dollar on a new toy and then spend that exact same dollar to buy an ice cream cone. It is wonderland accounting and even the administration's own Medicare actuary seems to agree. He said the Medicare reductions in the law "cannot be simultaneously used to finance other Federal outlays (such as the coverage expansions . . .) and to extend the trust fund."

Double-counting this money is completely illogical and the American people can see through the smoke-screen long ago. But the fiscal problems with this legislation are not even the half of it. As a former Governor, I shared my concern that putting 16 million people into the broken Medicaid Program is a fatal flaw of this law. Medicaid beneficiaries already have a huge problem finding doctors to treat them. Nationwide, 40 percent of doctors will not see a Medicaid patient.

The Medicaid expansion is like giving someone a free bus ticket, and then taking the bus away.

But instead of addressing this problem, the law exacerbates the problem by doubling the number of people on the broken system—Medicaid. If you have an airplane that is already overweight, you wouldn't decide to double the number of passengers to solve the problem, yet that is exactly what the law prescribes.

But even if you overlook the access nightmares created by this expansion, our States simply cannot afford it. States are already struggling to pay their bills and now we are heaping more obligations on them. As a former Governor it breaks my heart we are making those problems even greater.

That is why cash-strapped States are begging us for relief from the crushing Medicaid mandate headed their way.

One didn't have to be a fortune teller to predict the budgetary panic spreading from State capitol to State capitol.

And for what benefit? One year later, many of the promises that were used to sell this law have been debunked. For example, remember the President saying "if you like your plan, you can keep it"? Turns out, that's not exactly true. Again, the administration's own Medicare actuary concluded that the President's promise is "not true in all cases." Turns out truth seems to be more the exception than the rule with this law. One of the administration's own estimates projects as many as 80 percent of small businesses being forced to give up their current coverage within the next 2 years.

Remember the President promising that he would not sign into law any legislation that did not bring down the cost curve?

In June 2009, President Obama claimed that any health care legislation must control costs. He said, "If any bill arrives from Congress that is not controlling costs, that's not a bill I can support. It's going to have to control costs." One is left to wonder why the President signed this law since his own actuaries estimated it would increase Federal health care spending by \$310 million.

Earlier this year, the Medicare actuary provided a moment of sad truth. He testified that President Obama's promise that the health care law would lower costs was "false, more so than true." That is so astonishing that I will repeat it again—the administration's own experts said the President's promise was false, more so than true. That is astonishing.

Remember how the President promised that the health care law would bring down the cost of insurance premiums? As a presidential candidate, President Obama promised no fewer than 20 times that he would cut premiums by \$2,500 for the average family by the end of the first term. Yet the average employee's health insurance premium has risen by nearly \$1,100 per family since President Obama took office. A recent New York Times article highlighted this missed opportunity:

Groups of 20 or more workers have been experiencing premium increases of around 20 percent, insurance agents say, while smaller groups are seeing increases of 40 percent to 60 percent or more.

Finally, the first year of implementing this law provides clear evidence that the administration does not think this health care bill is good for everyone. The administration has now granted over one thousand waivers to certain States, employers, unions, and insurance companies, allowing them to be exempt from several of the law's new mandates.

The plans approved for waivers cover nearly 3 million individuals. If the law is so popular and so beneficial, why are we exempting almost 3 million people while the other 300 million have to live with its higher premiums and mandates? This and many other questions

have yet to be answered by the administration.

However, the President's recent budget request does outline his game plan to advance this flawed policy. The current strategy seems to be spending more taxpayer dollars to continue to try to convince a skeptical public that the health care law is good policy; and if they don't agree, use an enforcement hammer to ensure compliance.

Buried within the President's budget is a request for a 315 percent increase for the public affairs office at the Department of Health and Human Services. One of the primary tasks of the Public Affairs Office is to sell the health care reform law to the American people. Furthermore, they also requested a whopping 1,270 new Internal Revenue Service agents to implement the law and to enforce its individual mandate and other related provisions.

While Speaker PELOSI may have advocated passing the bill so that we could learn what is in it, many Americans were not so naive. They understand that you can't spend the same dollar twice. They understand that if something sounds too good to be true, it probably is. They know when someone shows up from the government offering a carrot, there is probably a stick not far behind.

Last year, a real opportunity to craft health care policy on a bipartisan basis was squandered. That missed opportunity will continue to haunt us.

Unfortunately, I worry that the second year under the oppressive provisions of this law will be no better than the last. It is regrettable that we have reached this point, having known so many of these problems existed before this law passed. But of course we were warned.

So, I will use the occasion of the solemn first anniversary to redouble my efforts to right the wrong.

We will work to wipe this misguided law from the books to protect the rights of Americans to choose their doctor, select their insurance, and trust in their own good judgment. Many are committed to the cause. I believe it will happen.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

SBIR/STTR REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 493, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 493) to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Nelson (NE) amendment No. 182, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 183, to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change.

Vitter amendment No. 178, to require the Federal Government to sell off unused Federal real property.

Inhofe (for Johanns) amendment No. 161, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements to payments made to corporations, payments for property and other gross proceeds, and rental property expense payments.

Snowe amendment No. 193, to strike the Federal authorization of the National Veterans Business Development Corporation.

AMENDMENT NO. 182

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 182, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. NELSON.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Madam President, I rise to speak on my amendment proposing a sense-of-the-Senate agreement to cut the Senate's budget by at least 5 percent.

When I go home every weekend, people come up to me at the grocery store, hardware store and elsewhere, and they tell me they are concerned about our national debt and deficit. They want Washington to cut spending and bring down the cloud of debt that hangs over our economic environment.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Legislative Branch Subcommittee, I have been pursuing a 5-percent cut in this year's budget for Congress and agencies and offices on Capitol Hill. We cut this budget a year ago, we are cutting it this year, and we will be back for further cuts next year.

My amendment says that as Congress pursues comprehensive debt reduction while conducting major military action on two fronts, all in the midst of a fragile economic recovery, Congress still should not be exempt from the pain. Fiscal restraint starts at home and with our own budget.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise to agree with my colleague from Nebraska, to support his amendment, and to congratulate him for his newfound enthusiasm for this idea.

Actually, on January 10, the House of Representatives passed a rule to reduce its spending by 5 percent. This measure was passed on a rollcall vote of 410 to 13. Soon thereafter, I was the first Senator to call on my colleagues in the Senate to cut their office expenditures by 5 percent. This small but symbolic step could save the taxpayers over \$20 million.

On February 4, some 6 weeks ago, I requested unanimous consent to take up a sense-of-the-Senate resolution I authored, urging all Senators to take such action. Unfortunately, at that

time and since then, there has been an objection from the other side of the aisle to this unanimous consent request.

My effort was bipartisan. I was joined by 14 of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, and I thank them.

We now have an agreement to take up my sense-of-the-Senate resolution by unanimous consent later in the day so as to expedite and refine enactment of the provisions of the Nelson amendment. Based on that understanding—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WICKER. I commend the Senator from Nebraska for coming to this idea somewhat late. But I support his amendment nonetheless.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Is there any time remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no time remaining.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Feinstein	Merkley
Alexander	Franken	Mikulski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Baucus	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Hatch	Paul
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Portman
Blunt	Hutchison	Pryor
Boozman	Inhofe	Reed
Boxer	Inouye	Reid
Brown (MA)	Isakson	Risch
Brown (OH)	Johanns	Roberts
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cardin	Kerry	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Chambliss	Kohl	Snowe
Coats	Kyl	Stabenow
Coburn	Landrieu	Tester
Cochran	Lautenberg	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Toomey
Conrad	Lee	Udall (CO)
Coons	Levin	Udall (NM)
Corker	Lieberman	Vitter
Cornyn	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	Manchin	Webb
DeMint	McCain	Whitehouse
Durbin	McCaskill	Wicker
Ensign	McConnell	Wyden
Enzi	Menendez	

NAYS—1

Sessions

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The amendment (No. 182) was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to reconsider is considered made and laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 193

Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 193 offered by the Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE.

The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, this bipartisan amendment is supported by me; Chair LANDRIEU; Senator KERRY, the former chair of the committee; Senator COBURN; and Senator WEBB.

This amendment is based on a report that was conducted by the Small Business Committee back in 2008, when Senator KERRY was chair of the committee, and we both requested an investigation into the National Veterans Business Development Corporation, also known as TVC, and found egregious mismanagement. TVC was engaged in mismanagement, misuse of taxpayer money, and did not abide by its statutory obligations.

Our committee issued a very detailed report explaining how they misused hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars. In light of our investigation and subsequent efforts, they do not receive any federal appropriations now.

But we want to remove them from statute so they do not have any Federal linkage, any Federal charter, or any ability to use the auspices of the Federal Government for any activities in the future.

So I urge support of this amendment and note that both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion supported discontinuing the funding for this organization, after our report was released.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I will speak for just a moment, if I could.

I know people in Washington and people in America do not believe we can actually eliminate a program. We are getting ready to eliminate one now in a bipartisan fashion to cut funding and to cut a program that has not worked. I just want to underline that we most certainly can do that in a bipartisan way. That is what this vote is about.

I do not believe there is any opposition, so I yield back the remaining time.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Feinstein	Merkley
Alexander	Franken	Mikulski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Baucus	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Hatch	Paul
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Portman
Blunt	Hutchison	Pryor
Boozman	Inhofe	Reed
Boxer	Inouye	Reid
Brown (MA)	Isakson	Risch
Brown (OH)	Johanns	Roberts
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cardin	Kerry	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Sessions
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kohl	Shelby
Coats	Kyl	Snowe
Coburn	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Lautenberg	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Conrad	Lee	Toomey
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Corker	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Lugar	Vitter
Crapo	Manchin	Warner
DeMint	McCain	Webb
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Ensign	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The amendment (No. 193) was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to reconsider is considered made and laid on the table.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Republican leader for 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I say to my friend and leader and to all my colleagues, it is of deep concern to the Secretary of Defense and to this Member, and I am sure many other Members, that we are defending this Nation on a 2-week-to-2-week basis, and it is harming our ability to defend this Nation's national security. I know we are probably now going to go into another 3-week continuing resolution.

Is it the intention of the Republican leader, along with myself and others, that we will not do another continuing resolution unless we take up a Defense appropriations bill for the year? We can't do this to the men and women who are serving—deprive them of the equipment, the training, and where-withal—when we are in two wars. It is vital, in my view, that we not allow another continuing resolution without addressing the Defense appropriations bill for, hopefully, what should be the remainder of the year.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would say to my friend from Arizona, he is entirely correct. I don't intend, myself, to support another continuing resolution. It does not contain the full-year Defense appropriations bill. I think everybody un-

derstands the urgency of that. My friend from Arizona, our leader on these issues, has been very clear and articulate about it. I can say with total confidence that the House and Senate are not going to be passing another continuing resolution without the funding for the Defense Department for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Republican leader, and I thank my colleague from Louisiana. I hope this message is transmitted to our friends and colleagues on the other side of the Capitol; that they should not send over another CR without funding the Defense Department for the rest of the year.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would say to my friend, I believe his position is shared by the leadership of our party in the House, and I think there is no chance we will not complete work on the Defense appropriations bill in the next few weeks.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, before I get into the business before us, which is SBIR and STTR reauthorization, a very important small business program, let me just add a few thoughts to the colloquy of the Senator from Arizona and the minority leader. I would most certainly support that view, and there may be others on the Democratic side who feel that way as well. As chair of the Homeland Security Appropriations Committee, let me be very clear that I don't think we should go to another short-term CR without a full-year appropriation of Homeland Security. Not only is the Defense Department appropriations bill absolutely essential to the well-being of this Nation, but so is the Homeland Security budget. They have complete jurisdiction over Customs and Immigration, over safety and security at our ports and our airports and train stations. We most certainly can't let our guard down as it pertains to our overseas operations, but we absolutely cannot let our guard down as it pertains to our safety here at home.

I hope both Republican and Democratic leadership, as we find our way through this complicated and difficult appropriations process, will remember Defense and Homeland Security.

I see Senator CORNYN on the floor. I know he is going to call up, with no objection from me, his amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 216

Before that, I ask unanimous consent to call up Casey amendment No. 216 to be put in the pending column. Senator CASEY will be here shortly to discuss his amendment, and then we will go in just a minute to Senator CORNYN.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU], for Mr. CASEY, proposes an amendment numbered 216.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require contractors to notify small business concerns that have been included in offers relating to contracts let by Federal agencies)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SUBCONTRACTOR NOTIFICATIONS.

Section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An offeror with respect to a contract let by a Federal agency that is to be awarded pursuant to the negotiated method of procurement that intends to identify a small business concern as a potential subcontractor in the offer relating to the contract shall—

“(i) notify the small business concern that the offeror intends to identify the small business concern as a potential subcontractor in the offer; and

“(14) REPORTING BY SUBCONTRACTORS.—The Administrator shall establish a reporting mechanism that allows a subcontractor to report fraudulent activity by a contractor with respect to a subcontracting plan submitted to a procurement authority under paragraph (4)(B).”.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Our intention is for Senator CASEY to have an opportunity when he comes to the floor.

Before Senator CORNYN speaks, for just one moment I wish to add a few comments about what happened this morning. We did get two amendment votes on the bill. Those were the first two amendments, the Nelson of Nebraska amendment, and then Senator SNOWE and I offered an amendment. We have approximately six other amendments pending not yet scheduled for a vote. Most of them were discussed at some length yesterday on the floor, the most notable Senator MCCONNELL's amendment, which Senator BOXER and others strongly opposed.

I wish to say one thing, as respectfully as I can, in response to a comment Senator WICKER made regarding the Nelson amendment. He said something along the lines that Senator NELSON had found some new—how did he say it—new-found enthusiasm for cutting the budget. In defense of Senator NELSON, I wish to say his enthusiasm is most certainly not new found. He has been a leader on our side in cutting the agencies and departments respectfully and appropriately under his jurisdiction. He has been the lead sponsor of legislation for a long time that has cut legislative spending. I might say it is very difficult with his bill because he also has had to absorb \$22 million in additional expenses related to the operation of the Visitor Center which all of our constituents enjoy and support. So he has absorbed that into his operating budget and still managed to cut.

I know Senator WICKER is relatively new to the Senate, but I do wish to remind him and others that Senator NELSON has been a leader in that field.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 186

(Purpose: To establish a bipartisan commission for the purpose of improving oversight and eliminating wasteful government spending)

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 186 and ask for its immediate consideration, and I ask unanimous consent that any pending amendments be set aside.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 186.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Tuesday, March 15, 2010, under “Text of Amendments.”)

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this is a very important amendment, which addresses the three critical issues that face our country today: too many people out of work, the Federal Government engaged in runaway spending, and our unsustainable national debt. This actually comes from a portion of President Barack Obama's fiscal commission report, which pointed out a Texas program that had been in place since 1977 and its impact on providing oversight and review of wasteful or no longer needed programs for spending.

That is what this amendment does. It establishes a bipartisan U.S. Authorization and Sunset Commission.

Actually, it would be composed of eight Members of Congress, who would go through programs that have spending associated with them but have not been authorized by the Congress, and who review redundancies and duplicative programs such as those pointed out most significantly by the General Accounting Office within the last week to 10 days.

As I said, this is modeled after the sunset process that my State instituted in 1977, which has been enormously successful. It has eliminated more than 50 different State agencies and saved taxpayers in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that Senators VITTER, ENZI, DEMINT, RUBIO, PAUL, ENSIGN, AYOTTE, and RISCH be added as cosponsors to my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. This is what the President's own fiscal commission has said about such a concept. I know Members of the Senate and the political parties are divided about many things, but this is something that should be non-

controversial and should be bipartisan. I hope my colleagues will listen briefly and consider cosponsoring and joining us in passing this important amendment establishing this sunset commission. Again, this is what the President's own fiscal commission said about this concept:

Such a committee has been recommended many times, and has found bipartisan support. The original and arguably most effective committee exists at the State level in Texas. The legislature created a sunset commission in 1977 to eliminate waste and inefficiency in government agencies. Estimates from reviews conducted between 1982 and 2009 showed 27-year savings of over \$780 million, compared with expenditures of \$28.6 million. Based on the estimated savings achieved, for every dollar spent on the sunset process, the State received \$27 in return.

We all know the challenges we face in Washington when it comes to proper oversight. Once programs are created—even so-called temporary programs—they tend to take on a life of their own. Indeed, I think that must be what Ronald Reagan was talking about in one of my favorite quotations, when he said that “the closest thing to eternal life here on earth is a temporary government program.”

We all know what happens once a program is created. A constituency is created, and they come in and ask for a cost of living or other increase, and they grow and grow, and there is no one—I am not criticizing the standing committees, but there is not adequate time or opportunity given to looking at these programs to see whether they are still needed or whether their budgets are justified. So you see these programs growing and Federal spending growing and no real time and effort given to cutting out wasteful spending and eliminating programs that have not been authorized or which are duplicative or redundant, as pointed out by the GAO.

My hope is that when we soon have a chance to vote on this amendment, we can all answer this important call. I think in the process we can ask the single most important question Congress can ask when it comes to spending and programs, which is: Is this program still needed?

A sunset commission would help us do our job of oversight and accountability. It would help rein in runaway Federal spending and, hopefully, along with growth in the private sector and investments by the job creators and entrepreneurs, help us get past where we are now, where we have not only runaway spending but unsustainable debt, and a private sector sitting on the sidelines not creating new jobs the way we need them to do it.

I yield the floor and thank the manager.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Will the Senator yield for a question on his amendment?

Mr. CORNYN. Yes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Most of the programs I am familiar with at the Federal level have built-in sunsets, because they have limited authorization.

How does the Senator's amendment either override that or undercut that? Why is his amendment necessary?

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I am glad to respond to the question. As the Senator knows, many programs that are currently up and running are operating on the basis of an appropriation without an authorization by the committee of jurisdiction, and that is part of what the sunset commission would look at because, frankly, it hasn't been authorized, the kind of oversight that is needed in order to scrub the numbers and make sure the program is still necessary and the spending is appropriate doesn't happen.

This also is designed specifically to deal with what the GAO pointed out in the last 7 to 10 days, where we have dozens of programs designed to do exactly the same thing. In other words, rather than making sure that existing programs work, we tend to layer those on over time, forgetting that those existing programs are even there. So this would be designed primarily to do two things: one, to deal with programs where there is spending because there has been an appropriation made but no authorization; and it would also deal with that duplication.

If, in fact, Congress comes back and authorizes the program, that is one way they could respond to the report of the commission.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator. I will comment, and I know the Senator wants to genuinely root out the waste and duplication. I only say that for programs that are operating under appropriations only. The Senator will know that that authorization is only intact for 1 year under the general rules. When you appropriate money, it is only for 1 year at a time. It can only be extended by an act of this body every year. On the authorizing programs, to my knowledge—and I will get the committee to check on that—Homeland Security has jurisdiction over government operations. It is my understanding that every authorized program has a length of time and that each committee here is responsible for their own oversight.

If the Senator is suggesting that committees either can't, or don't, do their work and we need an extra commission, we will consider that. I understand what the Senator is trying to do. I will have the Homeland Security team look at it on our side and we will respond.

Mr. CORNYN. I don't think anybody believes the way things are operating now is appropriate. What this does is it seeks to bring a new set of eyes, particularly regarding the spending levels in programs—whether they are necessary. As the President's own fiscal commission pointed out, this is not a partisan issue. We know with that kind of increased scrutiny, we can begin to cut out duplicative and unnecessary spending and prioritize those that are important, such as homeland security.

Part of the problem we have is that the spending levels we have now make

it almost impossible for us to decide what our priorities are and fund those because everything seems to be a priority. Well, everything can't be a priority, everything cannot be essential. This is a commonsense approach, based on an effective State model, that would allow Congress to do its job better and deal with the most important issues that face the country today, which is runaway spending and unsustainable debt, and too high unemployment.

I yield the floor.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Hopefully, as we go through the day, we will have a discussion on that amendment and others. I will try to give a recap. My ranking member is on the floor, and we wish to proceed today as we did yesterday, fairly orderly. We have made progress. We got two amendments voted on already. There are now several amendments pending. I want to ask this for clarification. We have Johanns 161, Vitter 178, McConnell 183, Casey 216, and Cornyn 186. Those are all pending, but no time has been established for a vote. Can I ask the Chair to confirm that?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Can I also ask the Chair this: We have filed and discussed Hutchison 197, Paul 199, and Sanders 207, which are not pending but have been discussed on the floor. Does that list exist at the desk?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Those amendments have been filed and will need to be offered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Let me say again how pleased I am that only a handful of amendments out of the 68 that are pending actually pertain directly to the programs we are getting ready, hopefully, to authorize. Actually, out of the 68 amendments pending, only 14 are related to this particular program, and 3 others to the Small Business Administration itself. I want to believe that is because Senator SNOWE and I have tried hard to take all Members' views into consideration as we have moved the bill through the process. As I said, yesterday, we worked on reauthorization of this important program—the largest Federal research program for small business in the country, the largest program—we have worked on this reauthorization for 6 years. So in the last three Congresses this bill has been debated, both in committee and on the floor, in the House and in the Senate. It has been modified many different times to accommodate different views.

The great news is that the bill is still strong, very focused. It provides an additional percentage of funding for small business so they can actually have access to the research and development dollars like big businesses, which often have better access. It gives an open door and an opportunity for small businesses—for some of our best patents, our best inventors, our strongest risk takers, which are often very

small startups. We want to encourage that, because the country is fighting its way—and I mean that—out of this recession. It is not easy, and it will not happen automatically. It will happen by what actions the Federal Government takes, State governments, and local governments, creating atmospheres so the private sector can grow. This bill helps to improve that atmosphere. That is why we are talking about this.

Many people have come to the floor and said: Why aren't we talking about closing the deficit? We are talking about reducing the deficit and debt, because one of the ways we do that is by creating private-sector jobs. This bill is one of the bills filed in this Congress—I am not saying it is the top or the absolute best, but I can promise you that it is one of the best bills that is filed that will have a direct and immediate impact on job creation in America. That is why Senator SNOWE and I are spending our time talking about it because it is a jobs bill. It is also a deficit closing bill. It is also a debt reduction bill. It is also a great bill that is going to help level the playing field between large and small companies and say to some of those risk takers out there who look at Washington and shake their head and say, What is going on, doesn't anyone pay attention to us, yes, we are paying attention, we know you are out there. We know if we can provide open-door access to Federal Government research and development dollars, we can have literally hundreds of companies grow and expand.

One example I gave yesterday—and I will give many more today—is Qualcomm, unknown 35 years ago. It started in Dr. Jacobs' den. It received early funding through this program, SBIR. They received multiple grants. You can get multiple grants as your technology improves and it shows promise. Of course, it showed promise. At a point, they were recognized by the venture capital community and investors came in. History has shown now that company employs 17,500 people and last year their local San Diego-based company paid taxes to local governments in California and around the country of \$1 billion. That covers half the cost of this entire program—one company.

That is why Senator SNOWE and I have spent so much time on this reauthorization and why she has been fighting for this program for actually almost 20 years, since she was a Member of Congress. This program is one that works. We have tweaked it. We have improved it. We are extending our authorizations from 4 years to 8 years to give certainty.

Those are some of the comments I wanted to make about the bill. We have, as I said, 68 amendments that have been filed. I ask Members, if they are interested in getting their amendments pending, to come to the floor to see what we can do to work that out. I

am not sure we will get to final passage of the bill this week, but we want to do as much work on the bill as we can so when we get back, it will hopefully be the first order of business. We will see. Maybe there will be a breakthrough in the next 2 or 3 days and we can get it done before we leave. That would send a positive signal. We are working with the leadership to see if that can be done. If not, we will continue to work this week to get as many amendments offered and pending and some votes today and tomorrow.

I see the ranking member on the floor. I wish to turn the time over to her now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I certainly concur in the comments that have been made by the Chair of the Small Business Committee, Senator LANDRIEU, who has exhibited tremendous leadership in bringing these initiatives to the floor for reauthorization. It has been a long journey for these programs, reaching the point of reauthorizing them for the first time since 2008. In the intervening years, the programs have had to rely on multiple extensions to continue to operate.

These programs are of indisputable value to the growth in America when it comes to innovation and invention on the part of small businesses. They undeniably have been critically effective. When they have had access to venture capital and research and development dollars that are available in more than 11 agencies across the government, including the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, to name a few, they have provided invaluable support to the entrepreneurial spirit that is so critical to this country.

As the Chair indicated, it is the small businesses in America, the one segment of the economy that undeniably creates the kinds of jobs that are so important to this country. In fact, they create two-thirds of all the net new jobs. We have to do everything we can to make sure that they are getting access to the kind of capital and support and the research and development dollars that are available at the national level.

These two programs, were created back in 1982. As the Chair indicated, I was an original cosponsor of that legislation when I was serving in the House of Representatives because we knew it could ultimately be a great catalyst for innovative and technological ideas in America. It has provided it, without question.

The National Academy of Sciences study of the SBIR Program—which is a landmark study—called the program sound in concept and effective in practice. Just over 20 percent of companies they surveyed were founded partly or entirely because of the SBIR program. Over two-thirds of the respondents said that the SBIR projects would not have taken place without the funding. Each

year, over one-third of firms awarded SBIR funds participate in the program for the first time.

Again, it is encouraging innovation across a broad spectrum of businesses and creating additional competition among suppliers for the Federal Government's procurement agencies. We see that it produces over and over again the benefits, the jobs, the creativity.

The Chair spoke about Qualcomm. That is true. We saw the Sonicare toothbrush. In May, we had a company called Tex Tech that developed armor for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. If we can give the infusion of these dollars—dollars already being expended by Federal agencies but redirected to small businesses and making sure that they are getting a fair share of the Federal pie—then they can put that money to good use in creating the kinds of jobs and the inventions that are so important to moving this country forward in the 21st century.

I am very pleased we are at this point. Hopefully, we will be able to get this legislation through and signed into law because it is critical to venture capital investments. It is a prominent source of investment in biotechnology research and development. As we know, it takes 10 to 15 years of work and hundreds of millions of dollars to bring a drug to market and to complete the testing of the drug process along the way costs millions of dollars. The biotechnology companies are able to commercialize their technologies with this kind of backing from these programs and money that is being expended at the Federal level in these key agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health. Such investments in biotechnology and medical device industries totaled more than \$1 billion in 2007.

Again, it is a demonstration of the kind of value and results we achieve through this program without providing additional Federal appropriations. It is not as if we are spending more money on a new program. We are not. What we are saying is that with the research and development dollars that are already being appropriated within the Federal agencies, we are asking that they set aside more than \$2.5 billion in Federal research and development to fund our Nation's smallest firms because they are the ones that are most likely to create the jobs and to commercialize their products. They have demonstrated time and again, year after year, at an all-time high, that the innovations coming out of small businesses are directly through these two programs. Their inventions reach the marketplace. They commercialize them.

Qualcomm, 25 years ago started with a \$1.5 million grant from the SBIR Program. They had less than a dozen employees. Currently, they have more than 17,000 employees in their company, and are a multibillion dollar Fortune 500 company. Again, it is an example how this program can work.

The Information Technology Innovation Foundation indicated in its report recently that 25 percent of the top 100 innovations came from small businesses funded through the SBIR Program, and stated further that it is a powerful indication that this program has become a key force in the innovation economy of the United States.

If there were ever a time that we should be supporting these programs and promptly and expeditiously, it is here and now. We saw last month where we created 200,000 jobs. But the month prior was 36,000 jobs. In order to reach prerecession levels of unemployment, it would take eight consecutive years of creating jobs at a rate of 200,000 a month in order to achieve the prerecession levels of unemployment of 5 percent.

That is an indication of how far we need to go to create jobs in this economy, and it is creating the anxiety, the apprehension, the fear all across this country because people are struggling to find jobs or to keep the ones they have. This would go a long way to benefitting the sector of the economy that does create the jobs, and that is, of course, small businesses.

Again, I hope that we can move quickly to get this legislation enacted and signed into law and create the kinds of jobs people in this country undeniably deserve.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, at this time, Senator CASEY, whose amendment is pending, wishes to speak a few minutes. I know at 12 o'clock, under a unanimous consent agreement, we will have a speech from the Senator from Connecticut.

I ask unanimous consent that at 2:30 p.m., Senator PORTMAN be recognized for up to 20 minutes as in morning business for the purpose of giving his maiden speech.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, first, I thank Senator LANDRIEU for her leadership on these many issues and especially on this critically important legislation to small businesses and for allowing me for a few minutes to talk about the amendment I have submitted. It is amendment No. 216. It addresses a crucial issue that affects subcontractors, particularly subcontractors who are minority owned or women-owned firms in the United States of America.

When I was the auditor general of Pennsylvania, we audited a similar program at the State level and found all kinds of problems, all kinds of abuses when prime contractors do not do what they are supposed to do. In many instances, prime contractors will routinely list a minority-owned firm or women-owned firm to make their application in a competitive process

without informing the named subcontractor. It puts that subcontractor at a disadvantage. Once the contract is awarded, the business is not given to the named subcontractor.

The purpose of this amendment is very simple. It will ensure that all subcontractors are aware of their inclusion in Federal procurement bids by prime contractors and establish a system in which those subcontractors can report any fraudulent activity. It is a simple but critically important remedy to part of this problem. We have more work to do on this issue, but it will give subcontractors the ability to more fairly and more fully participate in contracting. That is the least we should be doing at a time when so many small businesses are struggling to survive and to thrive.

I am grateful Senator LANDRIEU gave me this opportunity. I yield the floor.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I do intend to support his amendment. It is an excellent one. Hopefully, we can get a vote on it sometime today or tomorrow.

At this time, pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement, we will hear a speech from the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The Senator from Connecticut.

FIGHTING FOR CONNECTICUT'S INTERESTS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, the people of Connecticut sent me here to fight for their interests and today I rise to amplify their voices and share their concerns in my first remarks from the floor of the United States Senate.

I know these voices firsthand from listening day after day, year after year, traveling the State to be with people and to see people where they live and work, and recently on a 2-week listening tour as one of my first actions as a Member of the Senate.

What I am hearing is people are still hurting, still struggling, trying to stay in their homes, make ends meet, find jobs, and keep their families together. They feel rightly that Washington is not listening, Washington is not heeding their voices or responding with the right action or results.

The people of Connecticut are clear about their priorities. They want to be back at work with good jobs and a growing economy and responsible, smart cuts in government spending to reduce our debt and deficit. They want to know that Washington is listening to them and that their leaders are fighting for them, standing up and speaking out against powerful special interests and predatory wrongdoing. And that is the kind of listener and leader they sent me here to be.

In the northeast corner of my State, known as the "Quiet Corner," the president of Nutmeg Container Corporation, Charlie Pious, tells me he is hoping to hire more workers, but he has difficulty finding people with the skills he needs.

Not far away, in Putnam, at a meeting at the Putnam Bank with chairman Thomas Borner, one after another small business leaders tell me they could create more jobs with more certainty and consistency in government action.

In Hartford, our State's capital, we celebrate a Jobs Corps graduating class—kids who dropped out and came back through training and determination.

In Bridgeport, unemployed, older workers are crowding the WorkPlace, a highly successful job training center. There and all around the state, people simply want work.

At the Fuel Cell Energy Corporation in Torrington, R. Daniel Brdar, the president of this cutting-edge green energy manufacturer, plans to expand his workforce, but he needs to know that he can continue to count on the renewable energy tax credit and workers with the right skills.

In Waterbury, at a meeting hosted by Joe Vrabley, president of Atlantic Steel, small business manufacturers described again and again how they are facing unfair competition from companies in countries breaking the rules.

At Crescent Manufacturing in Burlington, Steve Wilson demonstrates the destructive consequences of Chinese currency manipulation, when they effectively devalue their money and subsidize their exports so the prices of their products undercut Connecticut-made goods and jobs.

The people of Connecticut don't need Washington to tell them what is wrong; they need help making it right. They want job creation to be the priority in Washington, just as it is in Connecticut. They are frustrated because Washington seems beholden not to them but to some of the financial gamblers who made the economy their own personal casino and put millions of Americans out of work and out of their homes.

On Main Street, small businesses struggle to get started and ongoing businesses face roadblocks when they try to grow. They can't get capital, credit, or loans. They can't find workers with the skills they need. They face unfair trade practices from foreign governments promoting the products of their manufacturers.

Taxpayers are angry for good reason, not just for themselves but for their children and the growing danger to the American dream, the great fear they will be the first generation to leave the next a lesser America and trillions in unpaid bills.

A new report from the Government Accountability Office documents what we instinctively have known: Waste and duplication in government costs taxpayers billions of dollars every year—early estimates say between \$100 billion and \$200 billion. And experts say we could save tens of billions of dollars by aggressively prosecuting health care waste and abuse, just as we saved millions of dollars going after health care fraud when I was attorney general.

The people of Connecticut—indeed, of America—will not tolerate and should not tolerate billions in waste and duplication. It must be cut. That is where we should focus, not on the thoughtless slashing of essential services that provide a safety net for our most vulnerable citizens. When we cut, let's be smart about it.

The people of Connecticut are sick of the special breaks and tax loopholes that have been protected for far too long—tax breaks to companies that send jobs overseas; subsidies to huge oil and gas interests, some of them the most profitable companies in the history of the planet; and giveaways to giant agribusinesses, many given tax dollars not to grow anything.

Shutting down those loopholes and special breaks and sweetheart deals will take a fight, but the people of Connecticut and the country are ready for that fight, and so am I. And we must fight. That fight will require support for the prosecutors and enforcers who prevent and go after waste, abuse, and lawbreaking. Cutting enforcement funds may make appealing political sound bites until we realize that real-world lawlessness has real-world consequences. Consistent, vigorous enforcement is critical. Good cops on the beat make a difference.

These steps—responsible cuts in spending, clear rules, and consistent, rigorous enforcement—are absolutely necessary to help our economy grow again, but they alone are not enough to create jobs. Washington must provide tools and remove obstacles to the people and small businesses that are the real job creators. We have to make "Made in Connecticut" and "Made in America" mean something again. We must invest more, we must make more, and we must invent more right here in the United States.

Step No. 1, we must invest more. We must invest in infrastructure and education—in roads, transmission lines, and airports, in everything from our grade schools to our community colleges and job-training programs. In New Haven, as just one example, cutting-edge biotechnologies are taking root and growing thanks to the Downtown Crossing project, where a new building and road rebuilding are necessary for dynamic growth. Instead of thoughtless threats to slash Downtown Crossing transportation grants, we should be encouraging this promising development.

In the coming weeks, I will introduce new legislation that will help small businesses to set aside money to invest and reinvest in their business.

Step 2, making more, which means more manufacturing and fair trade, and strengthening "Buy American" requirements to ensure that our tax dollars are creating jobs here not abroad. Chinese currency manipulation is costing us jobs and undermining our businesses, and it must be stopped. And we need stronger enforcement of laws to prevent foreign export subsidies and intellectual property theft.

Third, we must invent more. The renewable energy tax credits and other incentives which encourage businesses to create and produce green energy solutions should be made permanent. The R&D tax credit, which creates incentives for businesses to invest in research, should be extended indefinitely and expanded.

The people of Connecticut want bipartisan efforts to achieve job creation and economic growth. They want partnerships among business, labor, and education. They want bipartisan efforts to help our veterans so that after those veterans serve our country, they return to a paycheck instead of an unemployment line. That is why, in coming weeks, I will introduce a bill to help secure job opportunities for our veterans and provide training, health care, higher education, and more.

As I travel across the State of Connecticut, I listen to people like the Squatritos of Carla's Pasta. Their business is in South Windsor. An immigrant from Italy, Carla Squatrito started making pasta in her kitchen and grew it into a successful small business. This year, thanks to smart, targeted tax incentives, Carla's financial recipe includes investing in a fuel cell from the Fuel Cell Energy Corporation in Torrington to provide a low-cost source for most of her company's electricity needs. This cleaner, greener energy source will lower their energy bills and allow them to hire more workers and create more Connecticut jobs.

The people of Connecticut sent me here to fight for them—to fight for jobs and justice, to fight against a Capitol that caters to powerful special interests. The best moments of my career have been when we fought and won battles for ordinary people—for Skylar Austin and others when their health insurance companies wrongly denied them medically necessary, sometimes lifesaving treatment; for businesspeople such as Kathy Platt when General Motors sought wrongfully and unfairly to shut down her car dealership, Alderman Motors; or Terry, a marine, like many veterans, who returned from Iraq or other military service only to be denied proper treatment from our own government. I am here because the people of Connecticut know me as a fighter, and in the challenging time, again, I will fulfill that trust by listening to them and working for them and fighting for them.

As we gather today, young Americans are serving and sacrificing at home and abroad. Like all of you, I am grateful to them every day, and to all the veterans who have served and sacrificed before them, for giving us the freedoms we enjoy every day, including the extraordinary opportunity to speak today in this historic Chamber and participate in the greatest democracy in the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, while we are waiting for Senators to come to the floor, I would like to put a couple other quotes or comments from very well-respected organizations about the importance of this bill into the record. I, again, appreciate the 84 Members of the Senate who voted yes to bring this bill to the floor because those 84 Members of the Senate understand we cannot close budget gaps and reduce deficits without growing the economy. Those 84 Members understand that in order to grow the economy, helping government create the atmosphere for the private sector to grow is absolutely imperative. If we would spend a little less hot air time around here and a little more on illuminating discussion, the benefits of programs such as this would be clear. It is actually a Federal program, but it is a Federal program that establishes a partnership with the private sector that is exciting and that works and that helps to create jobs.

The Biodistrict in New Orleans, which was newly formed after Katrina, sent a document to the office that said, in reference to the temporary extensions of this program:

These repeated, temporary extensions have wreaked havoc on agencies' ability to make strategic decisions in regard to the programs.

The Small Business Technology Council says:

Not only does this program spur technological innovation and entrepreneurship, it helps create high-tech jobs, and does so without increasing Federal spending.

The National Small Business Association, another strong supporter, said:

The uncertain future of the program has deterred potential participants and investors.

We do not want to deter anyone. We do not want to discourage anyone from making that investment or taking that step to create the next business that could create not just a handful of jobs but dozens, hundreds, and potentially thousands. That is why President Obama is talking about—and I support his efforts—the need to outinnovate and outcompete, to fight our way out of this recession.

This bill of Senator SNOWE and mine might be a relatively small bill from a small agency, but it packs a lot of power and potential to create the jobs that people—in your home State of Minnesota, in my home State of Louisiana, in Maine, and other places—want to see us creating, with virtually no additional cost to the Federal Government. We are simply setting aside a slightly larger portion of research and development moneys already budgeted for cutting-edge research and develop-

ment and targeting those to small businesses that have proven themselves to produce excellent innovations, technology, and in fact have a disproportionate share of high-impact patents.

The National Venture Capital Association says:

At a time when our country needs to build new businesses, the venture capital industry believes the best use of government dollars is to leverage public/private partnerships. . . .

That is what this does. I know there are a few people around this place who do not think the Federal Government can do anything right. I am not one of them. I actually think the Federal Government can do lots of things right. Yes, we make mistakes; yes, there is money wasted; yes, there is duplication; and, yes, sometimes there is even fraud. But programs such as this need to be reauthorized. We have been debating now for 6 years whether this program should be authorized.

If it takes us 6 years to reauthorize one of the best programs in the Federal Government, I wonder how long it is going to take us to reauthorize some of those that are not as well run and to give us the opportunity to make them run better instead of just running around, throwing up our hands, saying nothing works, nothing ever works, everything in Washington is broken. This program is not broken, and it deserves to be reauthorized.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce:

The SBIR program serves as an important avenue by which agencies harness the creativity and ingenuity of small business to meet specific research and development needs of the Federal Government.

Might I say, they may be the today needs of the Federal Government; such as we need a way to cool our tanks in Afghanistan and Iraq because our tanks are operating in temperatures that are excessive. That was a real need of the Defense Department. They sent out, basically, an SOS: Can anybody come up with a better way?

Not only did we come up with a better way in a radiator out of technology we actually developed in Louisiana, but as you know, these technologies do not stay in the Department of Defense. Once they go out to be used in our tanks, helping keep our war fighters safe and helping win the wars we send them to fight, this technology can now be deployed, potentially, in the racing car industry or in Detroit or some of our other car manufacturing. While it is launched by Federal scientists and inventors and people who are good employees and good, solid Americans who are looking for a better way, it finds its way out into the general public for all of our benefit.

Let me give two more quotes. I see the Senator from Kentucky. The BioTechnology Industry Organization says:

This bill represents a balanced approach to ensure that America's most innovative small businesses can access existing incentives to grow jobs by commercializing new discoveries.

Finally, from the University of California, the CONNECT group says:

Because acquiring funding through traditional lending sources continues to prove difficult in today's tight credit market, SBIR/STTR grants provide tech start-up companies another viable chance to compete for early-stage funding.

Yes, there are many venture capitalists out there. There are always very savvy inventors looking for the next best thing. But before the next best things are invented, there has to be somebody betting on the human capital in our Federal agencies, the human capital in our academic institutions, and the human capital in small businesses that take the risks and believe they can invent that next best thing.

This financing is early. It is high risk. Not every SBIR grant works. But according to the man who gave us the review of this program, if every one of these inventions works, we are not running the program correctly. This program is early, before it is clear whether it is going to work, a chance to get it to work. But the upside is so great when one or more does work, and we have hundreds of companies that have sort of broken out.

I see the Senator from Kentucky. I will rest my discussion. I do want to put some other things in the RECORD, but to keep the debate moving forward, this would be a good time for him to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 199

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment, No. 199.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 199.

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment follows:

(Purpose: To cut \$200,000,000,000 in spending in fiscal year 2011)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE _____—CUT FEDERAL SPENDING ACT OF 2011

SEC. ____ 01. SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITION

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the “Cut Federal Spending Act of 2011”.

(b) DEFUND.—In this Act, the term “defund” with respect to an agency or program means—

(1) all unobligated balances of the discretionary appropriations, including any appropriations under this Act, made available to the agency or program are rescinded; and

(2) any statute authorizing the funding or activities of the agency or program is deemed to be repealed.

SEC. ____ 02. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.

Amounts made available for fiscal year 2011 for the legislative branch are reduced by \$654,000,000.

SEC. ____ 03. JUDICIAL BRANCH.

Amounts made available to the judicial branch for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a

pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$155,000,000.

SEC. ____ 04. AGRICULTURE.

Amounts made available to the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$1,427,000,000.

SEC. ____ 05. COMMERCE.

Amounts made available to the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$2,700,000,000.

SEC. ____ 06. DEFENSE.

Amounts made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$30,000,000,000.

SEC. ____ 07. EDUCATION.

Amounts made available to the Department of Education for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$46,258,000,000, except for the Pell grant program which shall be capped at \$17,000,000,000.

SEC. ____ 08. ENERGY.

Amounts made available to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$9,602,000,000.

SEC. ____ 09. HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

Amounts made available to the Department of Health and Human Services for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$26,510,000,000.

SEC. ____ 10. HOMELAND SECURITY.

Amounts made available to the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$4,603,000,000.

SEC. ____ 11. HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

Amounts made available to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$22,000,000,000.

SEC. ____ 12. INTERIOR.

Amounts made available to the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$1,808,000,000.

SEC. ____ 13. JUSTICE.

Amounts made available to the Department of Justice for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$4,811,000,000.

SEC. ____ 14. LABOR.

Amounts made available to the Department of Labor for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$3,260,000,000.

SEC. ____ 15. STATE.

Amounts made available to the Department of State for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$8,216,000,000.

SEC. ____ 16. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

International assistance programs are defunded effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. ____ 17. TRANSPORTATION.

Amounts made available to the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$14,724,000,000.

SEC. ____ 18. VETERANS' AFFAIRS.

The Department of Veterans' Affairs shall not be subject to funding cuts in fiscal year 2011.

SEC. ____ 19. CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Amounts made available to the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$4,135,000,000.

SEC. ____ 20. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

Amounts made available to the Environmental Protection Agency for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$3,506,000,000.

SEC. ____ 21. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

Amounts made available to the General Services Administration for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$1,140,000,000.

SEC. ____ 22. NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

Amounts made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$480,000,000.

SEC. ____ 23. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.

Amounts made available to the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$1,733,000,000.

SEC. ____ 24. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

Amounts made available to the Office of Personnel Management for fiscal year 2011 are reduced on a pro rata basis by the amount required to bring total reduction to \$133,000,000.

SEC. ____ 25. SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

The Social Security Administration shall not be subject to funding cuts in fiscal year 2011.

SEC. ____ 26. REPEAL OF INDEPENDENT AGENCIES.

The following agencies are defunded effective on the date of enactment of this Act:

- (1) Affordable Housing Program.
- (2) Commission on Fine Arts.
- (3) Consumer Product Safety Commission.
- (4) Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
- (5) National Endowment for the Arts.
- (6) National Endowment for the Humanities.
- (7) State Justice Institute.

Mr. PAUL. This amendment would cost \$200 billion in spending. Earlier this morning we voted, nearly unanimously in this body, to cut 5 percent from our legislative budget. Similar to so much in Washington, it sounds good. I voted for it. But 5 percent of our legislative budget will be a few million dollars. We have a deficit this year of \$1.65 trillion. We are awash in debt. It is America's No. 1 problem. Even the administration has said our national debt is our No. 1 threat to our national security at this point. We have to get our fiscal house in order.

Voting to cut our own budget by 5 percent is wonderful. It is a first step. It is about \$1 million—a couple million dollars. It will not put a dent in the overall problem.

If we were truly concerned as a body about our deficit, we could cut the entire budget by 5 percent. It has gone up by 25 percent in the last couple years.

If we were to cut our entire budget by 5 percent, it would be about \$200 billion. That is what I am proposing, a \$200 billion cut in spending.

Are we bold enough? Will we do it? If we do not do it, what happens? My fear is, if we do not have significant cuts in Federal spending, that ultimately in the next few years we could have a debt crisis. This amendment will give us a chance, will give the Members of this body a chance to say: Are we serious? Are we serious about addressing the debt problem or do we only want to do token things such as cutting our legislative budget 5 percent?

It is a good start, but it is not enough. This was actually only a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, so we didn't cut our budget by 5 percent. We said we might be in favor of that. This would be a real cut, \$200 billion.

I hope the Senate will support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask the Senate set aside the pending amendment so I can call up amendment No. 207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 207

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 207.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a point of order against any efforts to reduce benefits paid to Social Security recipients, raise the retirement age, or create private retirement accounts under title II of the Social Security Act)

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Social Security Protection Act of 2011".

SEC. 602. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Social Security is the most successful and reliable social program in our Nation's history.

(2) For 75 years, through good times and bad, Social Security has reliably kept millions of senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, and children out of poverty.

(3) Before President Franklin Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law on August 14, 1935, approximately half of the senior citizens in the United States lived in poverty; less than 10 percent of seniors live in poverty today.

(4) Social Security has succeeded in protecting working Americans and their families from devastating drops in household income due to lost wages resulting from retire-

ment, disability, or the death of a spouse or parent.

(5) More than 53,000,000 Americans receive Social Security benefits, including 36,500,000 retirees and their spouses, 9,200,000 veterans, 8,200,000 disabled individuals and their spouses, 4,500,000 surviving spouses of deceased workers, and 4,300,000 dependent children.

(6) Social Security has never contributed to the Federal budget deficit or the national debt, and benefit cuts should not be proposed as a solution to reducing the Federal budget deficit.

(7) Social Security is not in a crisis or going bankrupt, as the Social Security Trust Funds have been running surpluses for the last quarter of a century.

(8) According to the Social Security Administration, the Social Security Trust Funds currently maintain a \$2,600,000,000,000 surplus that is projected to grow to \$4,200,000,000,000 by 2023.

(9) According to the Social Security Administration, even if no changes are made to the Social Security program, full benefits will be available to every recipient until 2037, with enough funding remaining after that date to pay about 78 percent of promised benefits.

(10) According to the Social Security Administration, "money flowing into the [Social Security] trust funds is invested in U.S. Government securities . . . the investments held by the trust funds are backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. The Government has always repaid Social Security, with interest."

(11) All workers who contribute into Social Security through the 12.4 percent payroll tax, which is divided equally between employees and employers on income up to \$106,800, deserve to have a dignified and secure retirement.

(12) Social Security provides the majority of income for two-thirds of the elderly population in the United States, with approximately one-third of elderly individuals receiving nearly all of their income from Social Security.

(13) Overall, Social Security benefits for retirees currently average a modest \$14,000 a year, with the average for women receiving benefits being less than \$12,000 per year.

(14) Nearly 1 out of every 4 adult Social Security beneficiaries has served in the United States military.

(15) Social Security is not solely a retirement program, as it also serves as a disability insurance program for American workers who become permanently disabled and unable to work.

(16) The Social Security Disability Insurance program is a critical lifeline for millions of American workers, as a 20-year-old worker faces a 30 percent chance of becoming disabled before reaching retirement age.

(17) Proposals to privatize the Social Security program would jeopardize the security of millions of Americans by subjecting them to the ups-and-downs of the volatile stock market as the source of their retirement benefits.

(18) Raising the retirement age would jeopardize the retirement future of millions of American workers, particularly those in physically demanding jobs as well as lower-income women, African-Americans, and Latinos, all of whom have a much lower life expectancy than wealthier Americans.

(19) Social Security benefits have already been cut by 13 percent, as the Normal Retirement Age was raised in 1983 from 65 years of age to 67 years of age by 2022.

(20) According to the Social Security Administration, raising the retirement age for future retirees would reduce benefits by 6 to

7 percent for each year that the Normal Retirement Age is raised.

(21) Reducing cost-of-living adjustments for current or future Social Security beneficiaries would force millions of such individuals to choose between heating their homes, putting food on the table, or paying for their prescription drugs.

(22) Social Security is a promise that this Nation cannot afford to break.

SEC. 603. LIMITATION ON CHANGES TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM FOR CURRENT AND FUTURE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider, for purposes of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits program established under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), any legislation that—

(1) increases the retirement age (as defined in section 216(1)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 416(1)(1))) or the early retirement age (as defined in section 216(1)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 416(1)(2))) for individuals receiving benefits under title II of the Social Security Act on or after the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) reduces cost-of-living increases for individuals receiving benefits under title II of the Social Security Act on or after the date of enactment of this Act, as determined under section 215(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i));

(3) reduces benefit payment amounts for individuals receiving benefits under title II of the Social Security Act on or after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(4) creates private retirement accounts for any of the benefits individuals receive under title II of the Social Security Act on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) WAIVER OR SUSPENSION.—

(1) IN THE SENATE.—The provisions of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, present and voting.

(2) IN THE HOUSE.—The provisions of this section may be waived or suspended in the House of Representatives only by a rule or order proposing only to waive such provisions by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, present and voting.

(c) POINT OF ORDER PROTECTION.—In the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (2) of subsection (b).

(d) MOTION TO SUSPEND.—It shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a motion to suspend the application of this section under clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment is identical to the Social Security Protection Act I introduced yesterday with Senators MIKULSKI, BOXER, SHERROD BROWN, BLUMENTHAL, STABENOW, AKAKA, WHITEHOUSE, BEGICH, and LAUTENBERG.

This legislation has the strong support of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, the American Federation of Federal Employees, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Jewish Veterans of America, among others.

Social Security is the most successful and reliable Federal program in our Nation's history. For 75 years, through good times and bad, when the economy was strong and when the economy was weak, Social Security has paid out

every nickel owed to every eligible American. While we take that for granted, that, in fact, is an extraordinary accomplishment. It is all done at very modest administrative costs.

Social Security has been enormously successful in accomplishing exactly what its founders hoped to accomplish. Before President Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law in August of 1935, approximately half our senior citizens lived in poverty. Before Social Security, about half our seniors lived in poverty. Today, fewer than 10 percent of seniors live in poverty. That number is too great, but it is a significant improvement over what occurred before the establishment of Social Security.

What we should be very clear about, given the volatility of today's economy—there is a great deal of anxiety among the American people about whether they are going to be able to retire with dignity. At a time when millions of Americans have seen the value of their private retirement plans plummet, at a time when major corporations have significantly cut back on the defined benefit pension plans and 401(k) contributions, it makes no sense to me that anybody in this Chamber would contemplate dismantling the one retirement program that has been there for 75 years and has worked for 75 years.

There was an interesting article in USA Today yesterday. These are just a couple facts they threw out in yesterday's USA Today. The percentage of workers who are not at all confident about saving enough money for a comfortable retirement reached 27 percent in 2011 compared with 22 percent just last year—a significant increase in a 1-year period. When combined with those who said they are “not too confident,” the total reaches 50 percent of workers. So we are in a situation, according to USA Today, where almost 50 percent of American workers lack confidence about whether they are going to have enough money to retire with dignity. There is another point that the article made. This is what they say:

Quite a few workers virtually have no savings or investments. In 2011, 29 percent said they have less than \$1,000.

Well, you are not going to go too far in your retirement with less than \$1,000.

56 percent said that their savings and investments, excluding their home value, totals less than \$25,000.

The bottom line is, for a variety of reasons, A, the Wall Street collapse of a few years ago, the fact that wages for millions of workers have not kept up with inflation, a significant part of our older workforce today is extremely worried about what will happen to them when they retire.

Within that context, why there are people in the Congress who would want to start dismantling the one program that has, without fail, been there for 75 years, makes no sense to me at all. Let me also make another point. I think it

is important to make this point 24 hours a day because we hear so much misinformation coming to us from pundits, from the media, and from Members of Congress. So let me be very clear.

This country has a very serious national debt problem and a very serious deficit problem. We just heard about that, a \$1.6 trillion deficit. That is serious business. In my view, Congress has to be aggressive to address that issue. But here is the point. Social Security has not contributed one nickel to the Federal deficit or the national debt—not one penny.

So when you hear people say we have a serious deficit problem, therefore we have to cut benefits in Social Security or raise the retirement age, what they are saying makes no sense at all. These are two very separate issues.

In fact, Social Security currently has a \$2.6 trillion surplus. Let me repeat that. Social Security has a \$2.6 trillion surplus. That is projected to grow to \$4.2 trillion in 2023. In 1983, when we look back a little bit, it turns out that Social Security did face a crisis. At that point, in 1983, if the Congress and then-President Reagan had not acted, Social Security was projected to run out of necessary funding in 6 months—6 months. That is a crisis.

As a result of the discussions and negotiations and a committee put together by the President, Tip O'Neill, et cetera, a resolution was reached to that problem. The Congress overwhelmingly voted for it. Today is not 1983. Today the Social Security Administration has estimated that Social Security will be able to pay out 100 percent of promised benefits to every eligible recipient for the next 26 years.

This country does face a whole lot of crises: Unemployment is off the wall; childhood poverty is too high; we have serious deficit problems; two wars; we are worried about global warming. We have a lot of problems. But it seems to me to be totally absurd that people would say: Oh, my goodness, we have to cut Social Security because it can only pay out benefits for the next 26 years.

Go to Minnesota and say to a business person: If you could pay out all that you owe for the next 26 years, do you think it is a crisis? People would be shaking their heads.

I should point out that after those 26 years, if nothing is done—and I think something should be done—Social Security will be able to fund about 78 percent of promised benefits. So it seems to me that given the enormous importance of Social Security not only to the elderly but to people with disabilities, to people who are widows and orphans who have lost the income that a bread winner had brought into the family, we have to do everything we can to protect Social Security.

We have to make it very clear that Social Security is strong, can pay out every benefit for 26 years, that has not contributed one nickel to the deficit. And that is the amendment that I will

be bringing up as soon as I possibly can.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANDERS. I sure would.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Would the Senator explain—I think he knows because he is quite an expert on this program. I agree 100 percent with the views he just expressed. What is the basic average Social Security income that a person might receive? I understand it is somewhere between \$7,000 and \$10,000.

Mr. SANDERS. I think it is a hair higher than that. I think it is about \$14,000 a year. But the point is, I would say to the Senator from Louisiana, there are millions of seniors for whom that is either all or almost all of their income. That is it. That is it. In this day and age, that is the average. So your point is, there are people certainly below the average.

Ms. LANDRIEU. The reason I ask the Senator that is because it is striking to me that some Members from the other side of the aisle will come and argue that programs like this should be slated for cuts and reductions, and yet failed to vote favorably to raise slightly the income tax on families making over \$1 million a year in annual income. I, frankly, Senator, do not understand that. I am not sure people listening to this understand it.

Could you enlighten us?

Mr. SANDERS. Here is the story. I agree with you. I find it hard to understand that there are people who get up here—and we hear the speeches every day. They say we have a serious deficit crisis. It is unfair to leave that burden to our kids and our grandkids. We agree with that.

We say, OK, let's address the deficit crisis. But let's do it in a way that is not on the backs of the sick, the elderly, the children, the most vulnerable people in the country. So what this Senator is pointing out is that in the last number of years what we have seen is that the people on top have been doing very well—the top 1 percent now earns about 23 percent of all income, which is more than the bottom 50 percent. The effective tax rate for the very wealthiest people in this country is about 16 percent, which is the lowest in recent history. We have given huge amounts of tax breaks in recent years to these very same people.

So what I think the Senator from Louisiana is saying, and I agree with her, is, if we are going to go forward with deficit reduction, which you and I agree we should, let's do it in a way that calls for shared sacrifices.

The Senator from Louisiana knows that H.R. 1, the Republican House-passed bill, would throw over 200,000 kids off of Head Start. Millions of students who are trying to get through college would either get lower Pell grants or no Pell grants at all.

It is an attack, a devastating attack, a cruel attack, against some of the most vulnerable people in this country. They are cutting back on the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women,

Infants, and Children. There are low-income women now, who are trying to make sure they do not give birth to low-weight babies—cut back on their program. But when we say, well, maybe billionaires—who are doing phenomenally well—might be asked to pay a little bit more in taxes, oh, my word. We will have none of that at all.

So the issue is shared sacrifice. Do not balance the budget on the backs of the weak and the vulnerable.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator from Vermont for that eloquent and very accurate description of the situation we are in. I see the Senator from Oklahoma here for an amendment. We want to keep these amendments being discussed. So I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for joining us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, so the chairman knows, my planned time to introduce these amendments is 3:30. That is what they have given me time on. I did want to engage in some of the comments of the Senator from Vermont.

As someone who was on the deficit commission and looking at that, the first presumption was making Social Security solvent was our goal, making it solvent for 75 years. The flaw in the argument given by my colleague from Vermont is the assumption that the IOU at the Treasury for Social Security is good.

It is good as long as people will loan us money. It is not any good if they will not. So when people say, why fix Social Security? We can fix Social Security by taking the very haircut from the people the Senator from Vermont just described and markedly lessening the benefits, even though they continue to pay into Social Security, that they will receive, the billionaires and the millionaires. We can do that. But if, in fact, we do not send a signal to the international financial community that on the largest expenditure we have, that we are going to make it solvent, then we will not be in the market and available and have the ability to borrow the \$2.8 trillion.

Now, one other thing on which I would disagree: The Social Security trust fund trustees say Social Security is running a net deficit this last year and will run one this year and for every year forward in terms of what comes in versus what goes out. There is no question I want to keep our commitments. Nobody is talking about eliminating benefits except to the very rich in this country in terms of Social Security. As a matter of fact, the deficit commission raised the benefits in Social Security for the poorest in this country. So we actually did the opposite of what the Senator claims that Republicans might want to do.

What we have to do is to make sure Social Security is viable for the future. And having looked at every aspect of Social Security, I can tell you if we are not able to borrow the \$2.6 trillion, the

benefits will not be there. The money has been stolen. There is no trust fund. There is no money there. If you read what the head of the OMB said in 1999, he said it is not there.

So what is really happening in Social Security? Congresses, under both Republican and Democratic control, both Republican and Democratic Presidencies, have stolen money from Social Security and spent it. The money is gone. It has been used for another purpose.

So there are two ways of solving this: One is to make Social Security the priority and not fund anything but that until we get it paid back or we can actually refund that \$2.6 trillion by going to the debt market, to which we will go every year from now forward under the present plan on Social Security. The rate of taxes between now and 2035 that will be taxed will rise from \$106,000 or, I think, \$107,000 to \$168,000 between now and then. That is a 60-percent increase in the taxes on the wealthy that is planned and programmed right now.

Even with that, Social Security will run a deficit every year, every year now forward. Even with the \$2.8 trillion, it still is in a negative cashflow. So to deny the fact, if we do not want to fix Social Security, then what we are saying is we do not want to fix it for our children's children or our children.

Mr. SANDERS. Will my friend yield?

Mr. COBURN. I would like to finish my point. It is not about taking something away, except from the very wealthy, the fix from the deficit commission. That is what it did. We also added back. When you reach 80—and a lot of people may be running out of their combination of what their retirement was plus their Social Security—we give another little bump.

So what the deficit commission did was significantly increase the viability for Social Security for the next 75 years. The Social Security trustees know we have to do this. Everybody knows we have to do this. The question is, Does this Congress owe that \$2.8 trillion back to Social Security? Yes. But where do we get the money to repay it?

Unless we can calm down the international financial markets, where we make major changes not just in Social Security but in discretionary spending—\$50 billion out of the Pentagon, modifying Medicare, where we get the fraud waste and abuse out of Medicare—unless we do those things, we are not going to be able to borrow the money.

One final fact and then I will yield back to my chairman because I have a meeting to go to. So far, in the last 5 months, who do you think has bought our bonds to finance the deficit? We ran a \$223 billion deficit in the month of February.

Who bought them? Was it the Chinese? Who was the biggest buyer? The Federal Reserve bought 70 percent of the bonds we put on the market. What

are they doing? They are debasing our currency and creating future inflation which will hurt the very people who are going to be on Social Security because the cost of living index will never truly keep up with the real cost of inflation.

All of us have received letters from constituents wondering why there was no COLA. We know why there was no COLA. When we look at food and transportation costs and what they have done in the last 3 years, that is what is important to seniors—their health care costs, housing costs, food costs. Yet we have a COLA system that does not recognize that we may get into a period of hyperinflation because the Federal Reserve is buying the bonds because nobody else will buy them. Right now, 30 percent are bought in the market.

Final point. The largest bond trader in the world, PIMCO, last week sold every U.S. Government bond they had. They expect the price of the bonds to go down because they expect the interest rates to go up. What happens to us if we don't fix Social Security? If the interest rates are going to be a lot higher on our debt and if they are a lot higher and we owe \$14 trillion for every 1 percent increase in the cost of borrowing that we have, it adds to our deficit \$140 billion.

I am honored Senator SANDERS is adamant about making sure we keep our commitments. But in terms of cashflow, it isn't there. We have to address that. That is the only way we create confidence for the international financial community to say: You have a solvent program for 75 years—the largest segment of our expenditures—and we are going to loan you money. If we don't do that, interest costs are going to be higher, and we are going to pay for it anyway. Right now, we are almost to the point where these decisions will not be controlled by us. I would rather us be in a situation of control.

This is not a partisan issue. There isn't one Senator who wants to take money away from needy seniors. This is about making changes far down the road that will affect people 30, 40, 50 years from now. It makes sense to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me make a few points, if I may.

Is the Senator leaving?

Mr. COBURN. I have to.

Mr. SANDERS. I did wish to make a few points.

No. 1, the Senator from Oklahoma gave his understanding about what the debt commission would do to Social Security. I do not agree with his characterization. In point of fact, what the debt commission does do is cut retirement benefits by more than 35 percent for young workers entering the workforce today. Today's 20-year-old workers who retire at age 65 would see their benefits cut by 17 percent if their wages average \$43,000 over their working lives, by 30 percent if their wages

average \$69,000 over their working lives, and by 36 percent if their wages average \$107,000 over their working lives, according to the Social Security Chief Actuary. The proposed cuts would apply to retirees, disabled workers and their families, children who have lost parents, widows, and widowers. It is not accurate to say that the debt commission left unscathed workers—quite the contrary. There are devastating cuts to young workers.

If the Senator from Oklahoma wants to make sure Social Security is financially solvent for the next 75 years—and I want to see that as well—there is an easy and fair way to do it. It is a way that doesn't require slashing benefits for younger workers. When Barack Obama ran for President, he had a pretty good idea. I hope he still has that idea. What he said is that it is important to understand that right now somebody making \$1 million a year pays the same amount of money into the Social Security trust fund as somebody who makes \$106,000. If we lift that cap, start at \$250,000, ask those people to contribute into the Social Security trust fund, we will go a very long way to solving the financial solvency of Social Security. I think we should do that. That is certainly not what the deficit reduction commission recommended.

We keep hearing that the Social Security trust fund has a pile of worthless IOUs. The fact is, Social Security invests the surplus money it receives from workers, from the payroll tax, into U.S. Government bonds, the same bonds China or anybody else purchases. These bonds are backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. And in our entire history—and many of us want to make sure this continues—the U.S. Government has never defaulted on its debt obligations.

The point is, to say these are worthless IOUs is not dissimilar to saying: Guess what. Because we have a deep deficit and a deep national debt, we don't have any money to fund equipment for soldiers who are in the field in Afghanistan or Iraq. They are just worthless IOUs, and we can't fund them.

That is, of course, nonsense.

Do we have to address the deficit crisis? Yes, we do. But my friend from Oklahoma did not respond to the issue of why, if he and his friends are so concerned about our deficit crisis, they vote year after year for hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks for the wealthiest people or why they want to repeal the estate tax, which will provide \$1 trillion dollars in tax breaks to the top three-tenths of 1 percent.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, this has been a very interesting debate. It really gets to the heart of the larger amendment on Capitol Hill and in the minds of all Americans. How are we going to close this budget deficit, an-

nual deficit, and how are we going to substantially reduce the national debt?

I am pleased this discussion is taking place on this bill because the intention of this legislation is to close that gap by creating jobs. Some Senators actually believe we can accomplish that by cutting discretionary spending alone.

The Senator from Kentucky, Mr. PAUL, was arguing along that line, that if we just accept his amendment, which I will strongly object to, and cut \$200 billion out of the discretionary side of the budget, that will get us in the direction we need to go. All that will do is eat the seed corn this country needs to invest in important things such as infrastructure and education to secure the future for our children and grandchildren.

I remind Senators that since 1982, military discretionary spending has never dropped below 5.5 percent in any given year. The Paul amendment, if adopted—and I doubt it will be—would propose a 50-percent reduction in the discretionary funding of Education, Energy, Housing and Urban Development. It is a drastic cut that would not support a foundation for growth and expansion.

Having said that, the other offensive thing to that approach is that there never seems to be a discussion of a reduction of the military budget when it comes to waste, fraud, and abuse. There are billions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars documented in the Defense Department by the Secretary of Defense himself that people object to in trying to get to a balanced budget. Then we have Members who are trying to use the Social Security situation to argue for their point that the roof is falling in, the world is collapsing, and we have to cut back on Social Security.

I wish to add to what Senator SANDERS said and clarify something. I respect Senator COBURN. No Member has worked harder on the issue of deficits and debt reduction. I do not agree with all the things he suggests, but I most certainly recognize effort when I see it. Senator COBURN has most certainly put in the effort. When he says the Social Security Program is running a deficit in terms of money in and money out, he is correct. But, as Senator SANDERS pointed out, the reason is because the Federal Government used the surplus over the last 15 or 20 years to fund other operations of government. But the Social Security Program itself is intact. When that money is paid back, it will have a surplus. Using the fact that it is running an annual deficit to argue for either cutting benefits to Social Security or cutting benefits from education or from health to pay for Social Security is not a legitimate argument. Again, Social Security is intact. It is actually running a surplus. They would have a surplus right now in the account if the money had been left there.

It continues to amaze me that even in this discussion, we never, ever hear

from the other side a willingness to raise \$50 billion, if we are trying to get to \$100 billion in cuts—and some people want to get to 200, but we would like to close the gap by anywhere from \$10 to \$100 billion—if we want to get 50 of that billion by raising the income tax on people who make over \$1 million, we could get halfway to \$100 billion by doing that. But we never hear that. We just hear: Cut Social Security benefits, cut education, cut health care, cut Pell grants, cut homeland security.

I know we have to cut back on spending. I know we have to get our deficit under control. I know our debt is too high. But we are not going to achieve the goal of fiscal responsibility by cutting discretionary spending on the domestic side, which means cutting Head Start, Pell grants, and education, and adamantly refusing to raise the income tax for people who make over \$1 million.

This is going to be a very interesting debate over the next couple of weeks. It will not be settled on the SBIR bill, but it will be settled sometime in the next couple of weeks in this Congress. I, for one, look forward to the debate. I believe the American people need to have an open and honest debate about what is actually going on.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 183

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I believe there is a pending amendment, which hopefully we will vote on, called the McConnell amendment. It basically takes away from the Environmental Protection Agency the authority to regulate greenhouse gases. The Environmental Protection Agency gets this power from a Supreme Court decision that said they had the authority to do so. That decision was about 2 or 3 years ago. It came about 16 or 17 years after the 1990 Clean Air Act was passed. Those of us who were around here and debated and worked on the Clean Air Act of 1990 don't remember any discussion about EPA under that legislation having the authority to regulate greenhouse gases, but obviously the Supreme Court read the law differently than we intended.

The Environmental Protection Agency was told it could regulate greenhouse gases. The Environmental Protection Agency did not have to do that, but I suppose they are like regulators, generally. Some ask: Why do cows moo? Why do pigs squeal? And why do regulators regulate? Because regulators know how to regulate, and that is all they know how to do. So they are going to issue a regulation if they think they have the authority.

The situation is this: If we don't take away the authority—and in a sense overturn the Supreme Court case—EPA is going to put us in a position of being economically uncompetitive with the rest of the world, particularly in manufacturing.

When you increase the cost of energy by anywhere from \$1,800, under one

study, to \$3,000, under another study, per household, you are very dramatically increasing the cost of manufacturing. If we are worried about too many manufacturing jobs going overseas—and we if would let the EPA follow through with what they want to do, increasing the cost of energy—we will lose all our manufacturing overseas.

I have not checked the record, but my guess is a lot of my colleagues who are fighting the McConnell amendment and think it is not the right thing to do are the very same people who are very chagrined because jobs are going overseas and are blaming American industry.

Well, if we are going to pass a law that increases the cost of energy in this country, we are not going to have a level playing field with our competitors overseas. That is why I have always said, if we want to regulate CO₂, we need to do it by international agreement. Because if China is not on the same level playing field as we are, then we are going to lose our manufacturing to China and other countries.

It happens that China puts more CO₂ in the air than we do. Take China and Brazil and India and Indonesia, and they put a lot more CO₂ into the air than the United States does. Yet somehow EPA is of the view that the United States acting alone can solve the global warming problem? Well, even the EPA Director has testified before committees of Congress that if the rest of the world does not do it, we are not going to make a dent in CO₂ just by the United States doing it.

But the argument goes that the United States ought to show political leadership in this global economy we have, and if the United States would do something about CO₂, the rest of the world would follow along. But China has already said they are not going to follow along. Even Japan, which signed on to the Kyoto treaty, said they would not be involved in extending the Kyoto treaty beyond 2012.

If the United States did it by itself, under the guise of being a world leader and setting an example, and the rest of the world did not do it, Uncle Sam would soon become “Uncle Sucker,” and we would find our manufacturing fleeing the United States to places where they do not have regulation on CO₂, where energy expenses are not as high, and we would lose the jobs accordingly. In a sense, then, those people who have complained for decades about American manufacturing moving overseas would destine the United States to lose more of it.

I do not understand how people who are concerned about losing jobs overseas could be fighting the McConnell amendment. Because if we want to preserve jobs in America, our industry has to be competitive with the rest of the world. So I hope the McConnell amendment will be adopted, and I hope there will be some consistency in the reasoning of people who are concerned

about the movement of jobs overseas, that it is intellectually dishonest to support EPA adopting regulations that are going to make America uncompetitive.

There is nothing wrong with seeking a solution to the CO₂ problem. There is nothing wrong with working on the issue of global warming. But it ought to be a level playing field for American industry so we can be competitive with the rest of the world and not lose our industry, not lose our manufacturing overseas, and not lose the jobs that are connected with it.

But it often is the case that when either the courts or the Congress delegates broad powers to the executive branch agencies, it seems like we give them an inch and they take a mile.

There are plenty of other examples as well—and I will go into some of them in just a moment—of EPA having some authority and moving very dramatically beyond what Congress intended in a way that does not meet the common-sense test.

The work of EPA on CO₂ is a perfect example of this kind of overreach. First of all, they did not have to do it just because the Supreme Court said they could do it. But like regulators, they want to regulate, and they are moving ahead.

I suppose they are moving ahead also because, in 2009, the House of Representatives passed a bill regulating CO₂—a bill that would have made the United States very uncompetitive, as I have stated the EPA will—but the Senate declined to take it up. I think this administration is intent upon getting the job done, and so they go to EPA to issue a rule because Congress will not pass the legislation it wants.

It is so typical of so many things this administration is doing; that because Congress will not pass a law they want, they see what they can do by regulation. So they are setting out to accomplish a lot of change in public policy that Congress declines to endorse, but they are going to act anyway. If they claim the authority to do it, they will probably get away with it and avoid the will of the people, the will of the people expressed through the Congress of the United States. So if Congress decides to not do something, can the administration ignore the will of the people? Yes, they can, if they want to, but they should not, in my judgment.

It brings me to not only the McConnell amendment but a lot of other things we should be doing around here to prevent this outrageous overreach by not only the Environmental Protection Agency but by a lot of other agencies as well.

Because when the EPA and other agencies promulgate rules that go beyond the intent of Congress—and never could have passed Congress—it undermines our system of checks and balances. The American people can hold their member of Congress accountable for passing laws they do not like. However, when unelected bureaucrats im-

plement policies with the force of law that they would not have been able to get through the Congress—and that is without direct accountability when a regulator acts instead of Congress acting—something is very wrong, and it is against the will of the people.

I think it is time for Congress to reassert its constitutional role. We try to do this from time to time in a process called the Congressional Review Act. I recall last June the Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, proposed doing that on these very rules affecting CO₂. We did not get a majority vote, so it did not happen. Maybe in the new Congress such an attempt would get a majority vote.

We cannot apply that Congressional Review Act again to those same rules, so that brings about the McConnell amendment I am speaking about—to take away the authority of EPA to do it. But perhaps we can use the Congressional Review Act on a lot of other issues yet that regulators are regulating maybe against the will of the people, and I hope we will.

But there is one measure Senator PAUL has suggested and I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor to amendment No. 231.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. He uses the acronym REINS, but it is called the Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act. Basically, what it does—and I applaud Senator PAUL for his amendment, and I will surely vote for it—and that is, when we delegate authority to agencies in the executive branch of government to write regulations, and if those regulations are considered “major rules,” then they would have to be submitted to the Congress for our approval before they can go into effect and then would also have to be signed by the President before they would go into effect.

It seems to me that is a natural extension of Congress’s authority under the Constitution to legislate and to be the only branch of government that can legislate. It seems to me to be a very adequate check on out-of-control bureaucracy, that they can only do those things Congress intended they do in the legislation they pass.

I would extend my remarks on something a little bit unrelated to the McConnell amendment but still to the overreach of the Environmental Protection Agency; this is, in regard to some of their regulations on agriculture. When it comes to their regulation of agriculture, instead of EPA standing for Environmental Protection Agency, I think it stands for “End Production Agriculture.” That is not their intent. But in this city of Washington—and I describe it sometimes as an island surrounded by reality—it is evidence of not enough common sense being put into the thought process of issuing regulations. I could give several examples, but I may just give a few.

Before I give those examples, I wish to compliment EPA on one thing. A

year or two ago, when one of their subdivision heads testified before Congress—and the issue was agriculture, and she said she had never been on a family farm, in the 20-some years they had been working in the EPA and yet dealing with agriculture issues—I invited her to a family farm and she came and showed a great deal of interest. We had a very thorough tour of some facilities in research, agriculture, and biofuels industries within our State. They were very thankful we did it. I believe it has helped their consideration of the impact that maybe some of their regulation writing has on agriculture.

But, still, I am not totally convinced. So I would use one or two examples of regulation that is out of control. One of them would deal with what I call the fugitive dust issue.

“Fugitive dust” is a term EPA uses to regulate what they call particulate matter. The theory behind fugitive dust rules is that if you are making dust that is harmful, then you have to keep it within your property line. So let's see the reality of that.

You are farming. The wind is blowing, and you have to work in the fields. The wind is blowing so hard that you cannot keep the dust, when you are tilling the fields, within your property line.

Well, are you supposed to not farm? Are you supposed to not raise food? Are you supposed to not be concerned about the production of food that is so necessary to our national defense and the social cohesion of our society? Because we are only nine meals away from a revolution. If you go nine meals without eating, and you do not have prospects of it, are we going to have revolts such as they have in other countries because they do not have enough food? No, we have a stable supply of food in this country, so we do not have to worry about it. But suppose we did have to worry about it. Well, there is more to farming than just the prosperity of rural America. There is the national defense and social cohesion, and all those issues.

But the point is, they are thinking about issuing a rule—in fact, they started a process, 2 or 3 years ago, of issuing a rule maybe a year or two from now—hopefully, they will decide not to—that says you have to keep the dust within your property line. I wonder, when I talk about the common sense that is lacking in this big city—not only in EPA, but in a lot of agencies—do they realize only God determines when the wind blows? Do they realize only God determines when soybeans have 13 percent moisture in September or October, and at 13 percent moisture you have to harvest them and you only have about 2 or 3 days of ideal weather to harvest them? When you combine soybeans, dust happens; and if dust happens and you can't keep it within your property lines, you are going to violate the EPA regulation. What are you supposed to do, shut

down and let a whole year's supply of food stay in the field? No. Good business practices would say when beans get to 13 percent moisture, whether the wind is blowing or not, you are going to take your combine out into the field and not worry about the dust. Does somebody at EPA think John Deere and Caterpillar and New Holland and all of those companies are thinking about: Well, we have this problem with EPA; we have to do something about the dust and we have to control it coming out of our combines? Or, when our tillage equipment goes across the field we have to consider the dust that comes up from tilling the field? Well, we have asked these manufacturers. They don't have any solutions to these problems. I think they probably think it is ridiculous, after 6,000 years of agriculture throughout our society, that it is an issue. But there are people down at EPA who think it is an issue. So I use fugitive dust as one example as to whether they realize what they are doing to production agriculture.

Another one would be spilled milk. Milk has fat in it. So now they are saying if dairy farmers have above-the-ground tanks to store their milk, they are the same as above-the-ground oil tanks and they are going to have the same regulation applied to them as applied to petroleum. The compliance requirements on this have been delayed pending action on an exemption, so maybe this won't go through. But think how ridiculous it is that people at the Environmental Protection Agency are saying if you are a dairy farmer and you happen to spill a little milk, you have to follow the same environmental requirements as an oil company if they spill oil with respect to the cleanup. But that is where we are on these sorts of rules.

I have other examples such as Atrazine, and the potential application of Chesapeake Bay requirements to the rest of the country. But I hope we will take a look at this McConnell amendment that speaks to carbon dioxide plus the examples I have given of the harm EPA regulations will do to family farming and stop to think about it. We have to find ways to stop EPA from doing things that don't make common sense. I think a start would be to vote for the McConnell amendment, and I am going to vote for it.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 o'clock I be given 5 minutes to speak, and the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, speak immediately after me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the current debate over the Federal budget. Yesterday, we had a very telling and troubling vote in the House of Representatives. On the 3-week continuing resolution needed to avoid a government shutdown on March 18, Speaker BOEHNER was forced to rely on votes from House Democrats in order to pass a measure he himself had negotiated. The reason was that conservative Republicans abandoned their party leadership in droves out of anger that the measure lacks special interest add-ons dealing with ideological issues, such as abortion, global warming, and net neutrality.

In all, 54 conservative Republicans rejected the measure, even though it was necessary to avert a shutdown and even though it included \$6 billion in cuts to domestic discretionary spending.

This is a bad omen. This was not supposed to happen. Last week, the Senate held two test votes—one on H.R. 1 and one on a Democratic alternative. We knew that neither one would have the votes to pass, but we held the votes anyway. And, sure enough, they both went down. The purpose of those votes was to make it clear that both sides' opening bids in this debate were non-starters and thus pave the way for a serious, good-faith compromise. But, unfortunately, an intense ideological tail continues to wag the dog over in the House of Representatives. Speaker BOEHNER had hoped after H.R. 1 failed in the Senate that it would convince his conservatives of the need to compromise. Instead, those conservatives have only dug in further. Not only will they not budge off \$61 billion in extreme cuts on the long-term measure and special-interest add-ons, but they also won't support any more stopgaps to avert a shutdown. So Speaker BOEHNER is now caught between a shutdown and a hard place.

The Speaker has said all along he wants to avoid a shutdown at all costs, and I believe him. He is a good man. The problem is, a large percentage of those in his party don't feel the same way. They think “compromise” is a dirty word. They think taking any steps to avert a shutdown would mean being the first to blink. And don't take my word for it. Here is what some in the other Chamber are saying: Conservative House Member MIKE PENCE said passing a 3-week bill to keep the government running would “only delay a

confrontation that must come. I say, let it come now. It's time to take a stand." That is what Congressman PENCE said. MICHELLE BACHMANN said, "If a Member votes for the continuing resolution, that vote effectively says, 'I am choosing not to fight.'"

Outside forces on the far right are also cheerleading a shutdown. Tea Party Nation, for example, has called on Republicans to oppose any more budget measures unless they repeal health care and do away with family planning.

The tea party element in the House is digging in its heels. That is putting the Speaker in a real bind. His need to avoid a shutdown is in conflict with his political desire to keep his tea party base happy.

I don't envy the position the Speaker is in, but he is going to have to make a choice one way or the other. There are two choices but only one of them is responsible. The Republican leadership can cater to the tea party element and, as MIKE PENCE has suggested, "pick a fight" that will inevitably cause a shutdown on April 8 or the leadership can abandon the tea party in these negotiations and forge a consensus among more moderate Republicans and a group of Democrats. I think we all know what the right answer is. Speaker BOEHNER wouldn't have been able to pass this short-term measure without Democratic votes, and he won't be able to pass a long-term one without Democratic votes either. It is clear that there is no path to compromise that goes through the tea party. We urge Speaker BOEHNER to push ahead without them. We are ready to work with him if he is willing to buck the extreme elements in his party.

Throughout this debate, Democrats have repeatedly shown a willingness to negotiate, a willingness to meet Republicans somewhere in the middle. Yet the rank-and-file of the House GOP has been utterly unrelenting. They have wrapped their arms around the discredited, reckless approach advanced by H.R. 1, and they won't let go. Worse, the last few days have taught us that spending cuts alone will not bring a compromise.

The new demand from the far right is that we go along with all their extraneous riders. They do not belong on a budget bill, but they were shoehorned onto H.R. 1 anyhow. Now these hardliners in the House want them in any deal. These measures are like a heavy anchor bogging down the budget.

In recent days, a number of right-wing interest groups, such as the Family Research Council, began encouraging Republicans to vote against any budget measure that doesn't contain some of these controversial policy measures. That is why a compromise has been so hard to come by on the budget. It is because hard-right Republicans want more than spending cuts; they want to impose their entire social agenda on the back of a must-pass budget. Those on the right are entitled

to their policy positions, but there is a time and a place to debate these issues and, Mr. President, this ain't it.

If this debate were only about spending cuts, we could possibly come to an agreement before too long, but we will have a hard time coming to an agreement with those on the far right threatening the budget as an opportunity to enact a far-ranging social agenda.

The tea party lawmakers are putting a drag on the progress of these budget talks. Many Republicans in the House recognize the unreasonableness of the hardliners. KEVIN MCCARTHY was reported to have gotten into a "tense exchange" with Mr. PENCE, one of the lead defectors. Republican MIKE SIMPSON acknowledged it was "unexpected" to have so many defections yesterday. STEVE LATOURETTE of Ohio said passing the 3-week stopgap was "exactly what people expect us to do—find cuts and continue to talk." And MICHAEL GRIMM, from my home State of New York, said the tea party lawmakers were "a big mistake." This shows there are enough commonsense conservatives in the House to go along with reasonable Democrats that Speaker BOEHNER can find a way around the tea party. In order to avoid a dead end on these budget talks, he should abandon the tea party and work to find a bipartisan consensus. It is the only way out of this bind.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 197

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside, and I call up amendment No. 197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. LANDRIEU. No objection, Mr. President, but may I ask—I see Senator MURRAY on the floor and Senator STABENOW is on the floor, so I ask unanimous consent that after Senator HUTCHISON from Texas, we recognize Senator MURRAY for 7 minutes and Senator STABENOW for 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Texas so modify her request to allow the others to speak after her?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I do, Mr. President. I would like to have my amendment called up, then speak, and then I am happy to have the unanimous consent so that they know the order following me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. May I request of the Senator how long she intends to speak?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. For 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] proposes an amendment numbered 197.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the read-

ing of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To delay the implementation of the health reform law in the United States until there is final resolution in pending lawsuits)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 504. EFFECTIVE DATE OF PPACA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), including the amendments made by such Acts, that are not in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall not be in effect until the date on which final judgment is entered in all cases challenging the constitutionality of the requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage under section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that are pending before a Federal court on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Government shall not promulgate regulations under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), including the amendments made by such Acts, or otherwise prepare to implement such Acts (or amendments made by such Acts), until the date on which final judgment is entered in all cases challenging the constitutionality of the requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage under section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that are pending before a Federal court on the date of enactment of this Act.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I do wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana, who is managing the bill for her side, for allowing us to go forward with amendments. I think that is very important, and I do have an amendment that I think will help our small businesses and our States throughout the country. The cosponsors to amendment No. 197 are Senators HATCH, KYL, BARRASSO, BURR, JOHANNIS, MURKOWSKI, COCHRAN, MORAN, and ENSIGN.

We are approaching the 1-year anniversary of health care reform becoming law, and it is important to highlight the reality of what this bill has done to every American family, every patient, every doctor, health care provider, and every small business in this country.

One year later, the skyrocketing cost of health care is still the No. 1 concern among our Nation's job creators. Just today, my office heard from a small business in Corpus Christi, TX, that has 34 employees. This company has now gotten the bids for renewal of the policies they had before, and the cheapest option for their health insurance represents a 44-percent increase from last year's cost. They have until April 1 to decide whether to continue to offer their employees health insurance and to try to figure out how they are going to compensate for that increase in cost. But this isn't the first small business I have heard from that is telling me the same thing—that their premiums are coming up for renewal, they

are getting bids, they are trying to get the best bid they possibly can, and the costs are skyrocketing.

These price increases have not happened in a vacuum. They are the result of the 2,000-page, \$2.6 trillion health care bill signed into law 1 year ago. One year after that bill was signed, small businesses are facing unprecedented premium increases. Their policies are being canceled as insurers close up shop because of new Federal regulations.

The reality of the small business tax credits touted by the administration are really just an empty promise that a majority of small businesses will never see. In fact, the Obama administration estimated that by 2013 as many as 80 percent of small businesses will not even be offering their current health care plan anymore due to the new Federal regulations and mandates and the increasing costs, leaving the promise our President made—if you like what you have, you can keep it—as a distant memory.

A former Director of the Congressional Budget Office has warned that health reform includes strong incentives for employers and employees to drop employer-sponsored health insurance for as many as 35 million Americans.

A recent employer survey conducted by the National Business Group on Health reports that 81 percent of employers have experienced increased administrative burdens because of health reform. This same survey also reported that because of the increased cost from health reform, 68 percent of employers are increasing the contributions required for dependent insurance coverage. The Congressional Budget Office agrees and has reported that these increased burdens and mandates on employers will result in fewer jobs, as well as a shift from full-time to part-time jobs in our country. The Congressional Research Service adds that lower wages will also become a reality because of the new employer mandates.

The only good news our small businesses have gotten recently on this health care reform bill is from the courts. Two Federal courts have found the law unconstitutional—one in Virginia and one in Florida. In January, the Florida judge voided the entire law because the Constitution doesn't allow Congress to force individuals, small businesses, or families to purchase anything just because you live in this country. That is why I am offering an amendment to S. 493, the small business innovation bill, that would delay any further implementation of health reform until the Supreme Court rules whether the law is actually a valid law.

Included within the 2,000 pages of the law are provisions that harm small businesses, their employees, and families. The health reform law contains \$500 billion in new taxes, cuts nearly \$500 billion from Medicare to fund the new government entitlement, and puts the Federal Government between pa-

tients and their doctors. Health reform requires individuals and businesses to buy government-approved health care or have IRS agents knocking at their door. If business owners want to grow their business and hire new employees, health reform says: If you have over 50 employees, there will be costly new Federal regulations with which you have to comply. Small businesses across the country that now have 48 or 49 employees are facing a Federal mandate that discourages them from hiring more people. And this is occurring during one of the highest unemployment rates in our country's history.

We need to get government off the backs of small businesses, our job creators, and stop putting up miles of red-tape that restrict innovation. This bill is the perfect place to do it.

My amendment would pause further implementation of this law so that we don't spend millions of our taxpayer dollars and our small business dollars implementing a bill that ultimately could be struck down by the highest Court in the land in a case that has already said the law is unconstitutional. It is making its way to the Supreme Court as we speak.

In addition to the effects on the individuals and small businesses of our country, State legislators and Governors across our country are also making very tough decisions needed to close nearly \$125 billion in budget shortfalls. They too are having to meet the Federal mandates of health care reform. Their Medicaid systems are being drastically impacted.

Some States are saying, because of the Florida judge's ruling, they are not going to go further in implementing the law. They do not want to spend the millions if the law is going to be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. On the other hand, we are putting them in the position of taking a chance because there are fines if they do not implement the law in a timely way, according to the law that was passed. If they do not implement it, while the court has said the law is unconstitutional, they could pay, on the other end, by having fines because they did not implement it.

My home State of Texas is going forward with implementation, but they are facing a \$27 billion shortfall in their budget. Yet they are spending money that may be money down a rat hole to implement a law that may not be a valid law.

Today we could take one Federal mandate off the list. Today we can make it easier for job creators to create jobs. The least we can do for the businesses and States and families in our country is to delay the burden, the mandates, the regulations and taxes until the highest Court in the land rules on whether it is a valid law.

This amendment would not affect any of the law that has already been implemented. We are not doing something that is retroactive at all. But when this bill passes, everything going

forward would be halted until the Supreme Court has ruled on whether, in fact, the health care law that was passed last year is a valid law. I ask my colleagues to join me in taking this heavy burden from our employers and our States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, for her tremendous work on the bill in front of us today, the small business bill. It is so important that we keep focusing on what is most important right now for families and small business owners across the country; that is, to continue working to create jobs and boost the economy. That is exactly what this bill is all about.

Last month our economy added over 200,000 private sector jobs, and the unemployment rate fell to the lowest in 2 years. We have a long way to go, but I am confident we have turned the corner and we are now beginning to move in the right direction. But we have to continue to make progress. That is exactly why I strongly support this long-term reauthorization of the Small Business Innovation Research Program, which supports research and development efforts by small businesses that will help them grow and create jobs.

That is why I will continue working with all of our colleagues to make sure we pass a budget for this year that cuts spending responsibly while continuing to invest in programs that create jobs and boost our economy.

The Small Business Innovation Research Program, or SBIR, is a bipartisan bill that has been successfully creating jobs since it was signed into law by President Reagan in 1982. The resources this program has provided to small businesses over the years have led to new products, new ideas, and new innovations. In fact, small business tech firms that receive SBIR grants produce 38 percent of our country's taxes, they employ 40 percent of America's scientists and engineers, and they have produced many of the most important innovations that have driven our economy forward.

This program has been especially important in my home State of Washington, for over 200,000 grants have been awarded to small businesses totaling close to \$700 million. One company that received the support of the Small Business Innovation Research Program is Infinia, in the Tri-Cities area of my State. Infinia was founded in 1985 as an R&D firm, but they have been able now to successfully transition to commercial production and have emerged as a leader in our State's clean-tech industry.

With support from SBIR's other programs, Infinia has been able to develop their products and grow from 30 employees to over 150. These are good family-wage jobs in that community. This is such a great example of what

small businesses can do with just a little bit of support.

There are thousands of companies across the country with similar stories that have received a critical boost from SBIR. Unfortunately, the Small Business Innovation Research Program has been operating now under a short-term authorization over the last several years, and that creates uncertainty and makes planning very difficult for companies that do want to participate in this program.

I hope we support this long-term legislation that will help our innovative small businesses develop their products and expand and create jobs and we do not continue to see all these extraneous measures added onto it that will stop us from getting it passed in the Senate and moving to a place that can help create jobs and grow our economy.

I also want to mention another issue we are going to be discussing on the floor because it is directly connected to Senate Democrats' efforts to get workers back on the job; that is, the need to pass a long-term budget bill to keep the government open through the end of this fiscal year.

I am disappointed that the same Republicans who came into office saying they were going to focus on the economy have now put forward a very damaging and short-sighted budget proposal that would literally destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs and devastate our workers and small businesses and undermine our fragile economic recovery.

I am disappointed that at a time when our middle-class families still need some support to get back on their feet, Republicans have proposed this very highly politicized slash-and-burn budget that is going to pull the rug out from under these families at a critical time.

I am disappointed that while on this side, Senate Democrats have put forward some ideas to make responsible and prudent budget cuts that will allow us to continue to out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build our competitors, that we need to do, we are seeing a Republican budget proposal that is going to hack away at the investments that strengthen our ability to compete right now and improve the quality of life for all of our families in this country.

The proposal they put forward would slash programs such as Head Start. It would decimate housing and economic development. It would eliminate community health centers that the Presiding Officer has worked so hard to put in place. It would cut off critical investments for our workers and our infrastructure.

Independent analysts have said their plan would destroy up to 700,000 American jobs. That includes 15,000 in my home State. That is a hit we cannot take right now. It would be devastating.

Senate Democrats are trying to put forward a proposal that goes in a very different direction. We will cut spend-

ing billions of dollars, but we will do it in a responsible and measured way to protect our middle-class families and not kill jobs and continue making the investments we need to compete and win in the 21st-century economy.

Unfortunately, as we all know, we were not able to pass that proposal last week. Now, unfortunately, we are back to passing a short-term funding bill just to keep the government from shutting down. I have to tell you, weekly spending bills are no way to run the government. I am hopeful that moderate Republicans will say no to the extreme members of their party and come to the table to work with us to pass a responsible long-term budget that will help us create jobs and invest in middle-class families and workers across the country. That is what this is all about: creating jobs, getting our economy back on track, and setting our country up for continued success and prosperity now and in the future. That is exactly why this debate is so important, and it is also why having the Small Business Research Investment Program is so critical.

I urge my colleagues today to support this reauthorization, to support small businesses and investment in innovation and growth. I hope we can get rid of these extraneous matters for all of us to come together and do something that helps create jobs and gets our economy back on track rather than diving into all the political debates of the past and offering all the amendments we can think of in order to slow it down.

This bill is important, and I hope we can move it forward to final passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Small Business Innovation Research Act. I congratulate and thank our distinguished chair, the Senator from Louisiana, for her leadership and advocacy for small business. I was pleased to join with her as we worked very hard last fall to pass the Small Business Jobs Act to create more capital for small businesses to be able to grow and thrive and start a new business, expand their business. The eight different tax cuts that were in that proposal as well as beginning to take effect and help our small businesses.

This particular bill in front of us is one more opportunity for us to partner with small businesses that are on the cutting edge of innovation and new ideas. We just passed a patent change to update our patent laws last week. I am proud the one satellite patent office in the country is in Detroit because we are the heart of innovation and new technology. We need to make sure small businesses are able to compete successfully and have the partnership knowledge they need to create these innovations. That is what this legislation does.

We know small businesses create two-thirds of all new jobs in America.

Our top priority should be working with them to create an environment so small businesses can thrive and create jobs. I have to say, even in our wonderful automobile industry, which is roaring back, the majority of our jobs are in the small- and medium-size suppliers. It is very much about small business and medium-size businesses.

This particular program was first created by President Reagan in 1982, and it has helped literally tens of thousands of small businesses create jobs—new ideas, new innovations in our economy. We have led the way in a variety of military and communication and health care innovations. It has been extremely successful. In fact, small business tech firms have participated in SBIR producing 38 percent of our patents. Thirty-eight percent of America's patents have come from small businesses involved in the tech sector partnering with the Federal Government on new innovative opportunities—13 times more patents than coming from large businesses.

This is a big deal. This is very much about out-innovating in a global economy so we can compete globally and create jobs. Our small businesses in the tech sector employ about 40 percent of our scientists and engineers. They produced 25 percent of our Nation's crucial innovations over the last three decades. Unfortunately, this important partnership has been allowed to nearly lapse, and it had to be reauthorized 10 different times in the last 3 years—over and over again, for just a few months at a time. It is impossible for small businesses to plan for the future and be able to create those innovative investments and partnerships without a long-term view.

We have in front of us a bill that would reauthorize this important partnership for the next 8 years and give some opportunity to plan a little bit more long term, which I think is also critical.

We have many outstanding small businesses that are partnering right now with our universities and with our Federal agencies to create jobs and innovations. One of those outstanding entities is Cybernet Systems in Ann Arbor, a leader in research and development in the medical and defense fields. They are one of the largest small business innovative research contract winners. Because of their success they have now added up to 60 employees, and they have had 30 patents as a result of the SBIR Program.

Another important entity is Niowave in Lansing, MI, a high-tech business specializing in superconducting particle accelerators. They have been doubling their staff, and talking to them today, tripling their workforce because of new innovations they have created, they have now been nominated for the National SBIR business of the year.

Finally, an important part of our economy in Michigan—and nationally as we look to alternatives to bring down gas prices by having better competition for alternatives, alternative

energy through battery policy and electric vehicles—has been aided by the small business program in front of us today.

As an example, A123 Systems is a company that has received SBIR support. I was very pleased in September of last year to join with them when they opened the largest lithium ion battery manufacturing plant in North America, in Livonia, MI, and they are now creating 400 jobs.

I could go on and on. I will not in the interest of time. But focusing on small business, focusing on innovation, new technologies, will create jobs, allow us to out-compete in a global economy, and allow us to grow our economy. We in Michigan are very proud to be helping to lead the way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I know Senator PORTMAN is here on the floor, and under a previous order will be recognized in a few minutes. But before that, for clarification purposes on the previous agreement, I want to state that the next first-degree amendment in order after Senator HUTCHISON, who spoke a minute ago, will be from the Democratic side.

As a recap, there are, I think, seven amendments pending. We are hoping to get some votes on those amendments that are pending later this afternoon, potentially in the morning. If there are other amendments Senators have to offer, come down to floor. We want to limit, of course, what we can. It is very important for us to move this bill forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

TWIN CHALLENGES

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate being given the time to make a few remarks as a new Senator from Ohio. To be in the Senate, representing the people of Ohio, is a great honor and solemn responsibility, particularly at this critical time in our Nation's history.

And it is actually not an honor I expected to have. After representing southern Ohio in the U.S. House for 12 years, and serving in the Bush administration, I returned home to Cincinnati, OH, 4 years ago. Although we had kept our home in Cincinnati, and raised our kids there, I had commuted for 15 years, and it was time to be home with three teenagers, my amazing wife Jane, and other family members including my dad, one of my true heroes.

At that time, my predecessor, Senator George Voinovich, was serving with distinction here, and had said he intended to run for reelection. I was happy to be back in the private sector, involved in two small family businesses, practicing law, teaching at the Ohio State University and enjoying being a dad, including getting to coach my daughter's soccer teams. But I was also watching with apprehension the worsening economy and the way the

administration and Congress were responding.

When George Voinovich announced he would not seek reelection to the Senate, I made the decision to run because I was so concerned with the direction of my State and our country. I saw the bottom falling out of the Ohio economy. And I saw firsthand the pain that comes with layoffs and downsizing.

Like others, I was frustrated that while Ohio small businesses and families were making the tough decisions to deal with a deepening recession, the Federal Government seemed immune, and out of touch. Instead of cutting expenses and figuring out how to do more with less, and focusing on private sector job growth, the Obama administration and Congress responded with a big government approach. Unfortunately, the \$800 billion stimulus package had less to do with creating private sector jobs than growing the size and scope of government.

And, in the midst of all this, I saw a new national health care bill working its way through the system that would substantially increase the Federal Government role and lock in place the unsustainable costs and inefficiency of our health care system, making health care even more expensive for families and small businesses and making it harder to deal with the exploding costs of health care in the Federal budget.

And I saw record deficits building up to dangerous levels of debt that further threatened our economy.

These issues, these deep concerns over jobs and the direction of our economy and fiscal crisis we face as a nation are my focus now in the Senate. And I am not alone. Whether Republican, Democrat, or Independent, I believe Ohioans understand that our State and our country are in trouble, and it is going to take real change and all of us working together across party lines to set things right.

I believe the twin challenges of our time are how to revive the American economic miracle, and how to stop the reckless overspending by government that threatens to extinguish the American dream. And one affects the other. Without a growing economy and more jobs we cannot hope to reverse the dangerous trend of record deficits and deepening debt.

And without getting our spending under control, we can not get our economy moving. It is not one or the other.

These two goals are not inconsistent; in fact, they are reinforcing. With the fiscal time bomb on our doorstep and all the uncertainty it creates, we will never see the kind of strong recovery we hope for. We have to do both.

In addition to taking steps to get our fiscal house in order, we revive the American economic miracle by moving aggressively to create the climate for job growth, for innovation, invention, and entrepreneurship. We need an environment that encourages risk-taking and private investment, which econo-

mists will tell you is the biggest challenge we face in this weak recovery. The current economic climate encouraged by Washington is one of uncertainty and apprehension. I have seen it all over Ohio.

Last fall, I visited an independent trucking company, Wooster Trucking, based in Wayne County, OH. Paul Williams, the owner, pulled together a dozen or so local small business owners from the area for a roundtable discussion, one of the many I have had in the last couple years. Struggling in a tough economy, these small businesses all wondered the same thing: why has Washington made it harder on them to grow and create jobs, not easier? They talked about the threat of new EPA regulations that will drive up energy costs. Depending on their business, they were worried about other specific Federal regulations or mandates in trucking, manufacturing and banking that would drive up their compliance make them less competitive.

They talked about the threat of higher income taxes coming, which creates uncertainty at a time when the opposite is needed to incentivize businesses to invest and grow. Like the vast majority of small businesses, most of those businesses around the table that day pay their taxes as individuals not corporations. The temporary extension of tax rates and capital gains and death taxes, with the very real possibility of higher taxes soon reduces their incentive to invest and create the jobs we need.

Every single small business owner around the table talked about health care. All of them said the same thing. They said, since the health care bill passed, their health care costs are going up more, not less, and how that was increasing their cost of doing business and hurting their ability to create jobs. They talked about premium increases of 10 to 25 percent, eating away any profit and chance to expand even after cutting other expenses.

At one of the 80 factory visits I have made in the past 2 years, Bruce Beeghley, an impressive small business entrepreneur in northeast Ohio, told me his orders were picking up but he was not hiring. He was paying overtime instead of hiring permanent workers for the long-term because of the embedded and increasing cost of health care.

And our education system and Federal worker retraining system is failing us in Ohio: Around the State, high-tech companies have told me they cannot find the skilled workers they need. This is wrong: At a time of soaring unemployment, there is a skills gap in America. There are high-skilled, high-wage jobs available but our schools are not producing a sufficient supply of well-trained American workers.

You cannot be out there talking to workers and management without seeing these issues. But I have heard it closer to home. In fact, I am the product of small family business. My dad,

Bill Portman, who we lost at age 88 last year, was one of those small business risk takers. He took a big risk when I was a kid. At age 40, he left a job. He had a good job with a big company as a salesman. He had health care coverage and retirement benefits. He gave it all up to start his own business, Portman Equipment Company, with five other guys and my mom as bookkeeper.

He could not get a loan and his family did not have the money and the bank would not lend him money, so he borrowed money from my mom's uncle. The company lost money over the first few years, but they kept it alive through hard work, ingenuity, and sacrifice. My brother took the reins later and took it to a new level. By the time my dad retired the company employed almost 300 people, 300 families.

We all worked there, and when I was growing up, the discussion around the kitchen table was often about how government—taxes, rules, and regulations—affected Portman Equipment and other Ohio small businesses. My dad is among my heroes because of his hard work and sacrifice. Because with my mom they built something of value. I have seen it done, and I know the role government can play and should not play in helping to create jobs and opportunities.

About a year ago, I asked my dad if he would take the same risk today. He said, "I don't know, there's a lot of uncertainty out there . . . That is a word I hear a lot from small business owners all over Ohio. That is why a lot of job creators, or potential job creators are staying on the sidelines, and keeping their cash on the sidelines, and keeping their cash on the sidelines rather than investing in plant, equipment, and people.

Leadership is needed to create a positive climate which spurs job growth, drives opportunity and restores the American dream. Leadership is needed to get a handle on our serious fiscal issues. Instead, we are debating at the margins. You will see it play out on the floor of the Senate this week. We are locked in a fierce partisan debate about less than 1 percent of Federal outlays, actual federal spending, for this fiscal year. And we are not even addressing the biggest and fastest growing part of the budget, which is the important, but, unsustainable, entitlement programs.

In fact, as American families have tightened their belts over the past couple of years and businesses have had to do more with less, the Federal Government has taken the opposite path, spending more, growing bigger, and becoming more involved in our private economy and our lives.

Over the past 2 years, Paul Williams at that trucking company in Wooster I told you about had to cut expenses to stay afloat. They had to sell some of their trucks and let folks go. Here in Washington during that same time, the U.S. Government, though going deeper

into debt, borrowing more money, brought on more government employees, and grew in size. During these same 2 years, Washington spent 27 percent more in its so-called domestic discretionary spending that is being debated this week. And that does not count the stimulus bill and other one-time spending, which gave us staggering 80 percent increase in this type of spending in 2 short years.

This historic failure to control spending, directly affects all of us because it affects our economy and the ability to create jobs. It pushes up interest rates, affecting car loans, mortgages, and student loans, and crowds out private investment, and leaves us with three bad choices, far higher taxes, even more borrowing, or both.

This will surprise no one, but recently, a group of 47 respected business economists agreed that the greatest threat to our economy was our debt and deficits.

Restoring fiscal restraint is critical to creating the certainty that employers and entrepreneurs need to create jobs across Ohio and our country. It is truly dangerous because left unchecked, these mounting debts are likely to lead to the kind of debt crisis we have seen in Greece and other countries.

The government spending more than it takes in hurts our economy today and mortgages the future for our children and grandchildren. Think about this: every child born in America today automatically, through no fault of their own, inherits \$45,000 in U.S. debt.

People are looking for a better way. People are looking for leadership from Washington that takes on those challenges that Ohio's businesses and workers face. The status quo is not working. There is an urgency about this that the American people get, even while many in Washington seem to be in denial. We must rise to the challenge and work together across party lines to meet our economic and fiscal problems head-on by aggressively putting in place pro-growth measures and spending restraint, and we must do it now.

We must think and act differently to compete and win in the global economy, regain America's place in the world and give working families the hope of a better tomorrow. We can no longer rest on our laurels, no longer afford the luxury of living with a sub-standard education system that does not produce young people with the 21st century skills they need to succeed. We cannot afford a bureaucratic regulatory regime and a hopelessly complicated Tax Code that favors social engineering over sound business decisions. We can no longer sit back while our dependence on imported oil charts our destiny rather than American technology and innovation.

And we cannot compete and win if our health care system is so inefficient that its costs are double the rest of the developed world while outcomes are unsatisfactory, especially for those

millions of American families without coverage. This is wrong for the small businesses at the roundtable I talked about earlier who are trying to provide health care and yet stay afloat. And it is wrong for working families whose rising costs are eating away at their opportunity to move up the ladder.

To revive the American economic miracle, we need to revolutionize the way we think about all the major institutions of our economy. We need structural reform of our regulatory system, energy policy, tax code, worker retraining and education, health care delivery, our trade policy and legal system. And of course, we must fix our broken budgeting process that has us so deeply in debt.

These challenges are not insurmountable. I know because we are Americans and we have done this before. We waged a World War that required more resources and sacrifices than anything we face today, and we have come out stronger. We survived a Civil War, a Great Depression, and a Cold War to emerge as the beacon of hope and opportunity for the rest of the world.

There is a long line of distinguished Senators from Ohio who were part of these historic times, including Warren G. Harding and William Henry Harrison.

One famous predecessor is John Glenn, an American hero who, along with his wife, Annie, I have been honored to know and work with over the years. And immediately follow Senator George Voinovich—one of the very finest public servants our State has ever known. Jane and I are grateful to George and Janet for their support and friendship, and for the extraordinary legacy they leave.

And there is another former Ohio Senator whose desk I requested and speak from today: Robert A. Taft, a fellow Cincinnati, who actually worked at the same law firm where I was a partner before being elected to Congress. Like me, he also served in the executive branch. Unlike me, he was first in his class in high school, college and law school and was said to have had "the best mind in Washington." Democrats joked that "he had the best mind in Washington until he made it up." He was a principled and effective Republican leader. In fact, when his peers commissioned a review of the top five U.S. Senators in history, he was selected to be among them. That is why he is one of only five Senators to have a portrait in the President's Room off the Senate floor. He was a featured "Profile in Courage" in John Kennedy's book; on his memorial across Constitution Avenue it is written that it "stands as a tribute to the honesty, indomitable courage and high principles of free governments symbolized by his life."

It is always dangerous to predict how a former Senator would react to today's predicaments. But I am confident that were Robert A. Taft among us today, he would rise in full-throated

support of addressing the twin challenges we have talked about today. His honesty would force him to admit that our economic systems are not up to the global competition of the 21st century, his courage would force him to insist we address our budget woes, including entitlements, and his love of liberty would compel him to fight for solutions to our economic challenges that promote free markets and the power and dignity of the individual over the heavy hand of government.

As we have discussed, there is a lot of hard work to do. In my role, I hope to be worthy of this great and temporary privilege. I will rely on my faith, my family, and the good people of Ohio. I will work constructively with my colleagues to achieve results, including working with the senior Senator from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN, and others across the aisle. I will work every day to try to earn the confidence and trust the people of Ohio have placed in me. As we go forward together, may God bless Ohio and this great Nation and help guide us in our shared commitment to a better future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Ohio, I have listened with great interest to his first speech in the Senate. I was particularly interested in his reference to Robert A. Taft, whose portrait is in the Republican leader's office and has been there for some time. In fact, the place that is currently the office of the Republican leader became the office of the Republican leader about the time Senator Taft, in that all-too-brief period, was majority leader. He was actually only in that position for about 8 months before he passed away, but he left an incredible impression in this town, which the junior Senator from Ohio pointed out.

Listening to the new Senator from Ohio, he is entirely able to fill the shoes of those who have come before representing the great State of Ohio in the Senate. He made reference to some of them. I predict by the time the Senator from Ohio leaves this body, he will be widely referred to in the same category.

I thank him for his important first contribution in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I join the Republican leader in congratulating Senator PORTMAN on his first speech on the Senate floor. I remember those days some 4 years ago when I had the honor of doing that. I know how close ROB and Jane are and their children. I have seen them often over the last year, and I know the sacrifice and difficulty of leaving home, as he points out. I know he feels that way about his family. I look forward to this relationship. I look forward to what we have been working to do, especially on manufacturing, on jobs. Senator PORTMAN

has visited some 80 manufacturing plants in the last 3 years. He sees what I see on the shop floors. If we keep these jobs in the United States—much of the innovation is done on the shop floor—we will continue to lead the world in innovation and continue to lead the world in job creation. That is the importance of working with small- and medium-size and large manufacturing companies.

I also would add that Senator PORTMAN already understands Ohio is the home of two major Federal installations, NASA Glenn in Cleveland and, in the part of the State I live in, Wright Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton. In the part of the State Senator PORTMAN lives in, there is the Battelle Memorial Institute, in Columbus, which, while not a Federal agency per se, serves much of the Federal Government by running the country's energy labs. There is synergism among those three, coupled with Ohio State and Case Western. I met today with President Williams of the University of Cincinnati, Senator PORTMAN's hometown. The kind of synergism that comes out of this and innovation and high-end manufacturing and all the kinds of things that he and Senator PORTMAN and I will do together in job creation, whether it is USEC in southern Ohio or the solar industry in Toledo or the auto industry in the north or the aerospace industry in the southwest and throughout the State, this kind of work will absolutely matter to put people back to work and create the kinds of good-paying industrial jobs and good-paying other jobs Ohioans aspire to, to create a strong, vibrant middle class.

I congratulate Senator PORTMAN.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to thank all of my colleagues for really helping us to focus on this debate yesterday and today. We started discussing the reauthorization of the SBIR and STTR Programs within the Small Business Administration. Senator SNOWE has been on the floor most of the day yesterday and part of the day today as we have managed this bill.

As I have said many times, this particular program is the Federal Government's largest research program for small business. It was started in 1982 by a bipartisan group of Senators and House Members who believed small businesses in America had something to contribute in the technological and scientific advances in this country, and they were right. They said the Federal

Government spends billions of dollars every year on research and development, and yet some of our most promising small businesses—maybe independent scientists or researchers or engineers or inventors of all different backgrounds and persuasions—could not really get in the front door of the Department of Defense or NIH. In those days, people only wanted to see people from big companies.

Well, not only was that not allowing small business an opportunity, but it was shortchanging the taxpayers because what taxpayers want is the best technology. It does not matter to them whether it comes from a small shop down the street operating on the second floor above a doughnut shop—like my father got started many years ago—or whether it comes from the back office of IBM. They just want the best, and they deserve it. This program delivers it. So this is about innovation and jobs.

One thing I want to stress again: Several people have come down to the floor and said, why aren't we—I guess meaning Democrats—focused like a laser on closing the budget gap?

Let me say that this is an effort to close the budget gap and to reduce the debt and to close the annual deficit because that can be done by cutting discretionary spending, cutting defense spending, where it is wasteful and not effective, raising revenues where it is appropriate—particularly for those making over \$1 million a year would be a good place to start—and most importantly or equally important to all of the above is creating an atmosphere so the private sector can get about the business of creating jobs. That is what this program does. That is why Senator SNOWE and I are on the floor. That is why our committee voted this bill out 18 to 1. We know it is important. Innovation creates jobs.

I want to show you just three examples, as we are waiting for Senators to come to the floor to talk about their amendments. I want to share one story. This is from Connecticut.

Might I say that over the 20-plus years of this program, there have been small businesses in every State that have benefited either through grants or through contracts. The Department of Defense has about \$1 billion of their research and development set aside for this purpose. Other departments call them grants. The Department of Defense actually enters into contracts with small businesses.

I am not sure if this example came out of the Department of Defense. It is not noted on the chart. But one of our agencies thought it might be important to create a device to safely transport toxic chemicals.

I am from Louisiana. We have a tremendous and are proud of our industrial base in petrochemicals. Some things we produce are really safe. Some things we produce are quite dangerous but necessary to undergird our economy. So the transport of these toxic

chemicals—to do it safely—is important.

So one of the agencies—and I do not have exactly which one—identified a company in Connecticut that might be able to come up with some such device. They did. That particular company, which is now ATMI, paid more than 10 times in taxes now that that invention has been commercialized, as we can see here on this chart. But what people really need to know is that this company paid more than 10 times in taxes than what they received from the program. This is just one example.

ATMI went from 40 employees to employing 800 people worldwide. I am hoping their company is still located in Danbury, CT, and I am hoping most of these 800 people are working in America. There is no requirement in this particular program for that to occur, and we would not want to have that requirement because we are producing technology and innovation for America and for the world, and our people will benefit from it. But let's hope that is the case. That is just one example.

A second example comes from Ann Arbor, MI. Senator STABENOW was on the floor earlier today, and I thank her so very much. She was a very strong supporter of our very important small business jobs and innovation bill in the last Congress. I am pleased the leadership has given our committee an opportunity to be on the floor with another important bill so early in this Congress.

I think Leader REID knows and feels strongly—as strongly as I do—that there are more ways to cut a deficit than the one being trumpeted on the other side of this Capitol, and it is not even a way because it will not work. All we hear from the other Chamber is cut discretionary spending and you will get there. A, we will not get there, and B, we are going to shoot off both feet in the process of trying to go down that road because it is a road to a dead end.

You cannot get to where we want to go the way some people are arguing. We can get to reducing our deficit, eliminating our debt, by doing all four of the things I mentioned, and one of them is creating jobs and doing it in the private sector.

This is a Cybernet ammo sorter, as shown on this chart. This did come from the Defense Department. When people ask, how can you save millions of dollars, well, this particular invention has saved the government hundreds of millions of dollars in defense costs over 5 years. It started in Michigan. Now it is expanding to Florida. That will make Senator NELSON very happy. It was initially implemented at one of our camps in Kuwait. It was in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. It is now also in use at Fort Irwin, the National Training Center in the Mojave Desert, where troops train before deployment. It sorts ammunition in a way that saves our troops many manhours and hundreds of millions of dollars.

So there is another way to cut spending besides just slashing and burning some of the best programs in the world, literally. Some of the best programs in the world have been left on the chopping block—not just in America, in the world, have been left on the chopping block—on the House of Representatives floor.

I might suggest that they think outside the box and they think of other ways to reduce spending, which is investing in smart investments that streamline operations, that create efficiencies and save taxpayers money and create jobs at the same time; thus, companies can pay in more taxes at the local, State, and Federal levels, and we continue to get spending under control and reduce our deficit.

So that is Cybernet's Automated Tactical Ammunition Classification System. Leave it to the Department of Defense to make up such a name.

As shown on this chart, this is Beacon Interactive Systems' TurboWork out of Cambridge, MA. This company created technology to help sailors keep the fleet safe through streamlined and uniformed maintenance. It will be going now into all 250 ships in the Navy, and 460,000 sailors will use this technology developed out of the SBIR Program every day to protect and preserve our warships. In its first full year of implementation, the software should give a 300-percent return on the initial SBIR investment.

The Presiding Officer knows this because he has been a very strong advocate nationally—not just in the State of Oregon—for small business. The Presiding Officer knows that with a little investment at the right time, there can be a tremendous upside, and that is what we are seeing here with this program.

Our initial grants are only \$150,000. People might say, geez, what can you do with \$150,000? Well, \$150,000 given to the scientist or the engineer or the inventor at the right time can help provide that half-year or year of research and development necessary to grow and to mobilize the technologies to develop it into something that could work. Then phase II comes in with the potential: If it looks inviting and exciting and interesting to the agency, they might award such a grantee another \$150,000 for phase II, and then it can go up to \$1.5 million. That is the way these companies or these ideas grow.

At some point, this program ceases to be necessary because what happens is it either becomes clear to the people managing it that this idea has failed, the technology is not going to work and the grant is simply shut down or the contract comes to end, then, yes, that money will be lost. But what often happens, although not in every case, is that technology goes to such a phase that it becomes so promising that venture capitalists step in, as they should, and other investors step in and take that company way up. That is what happened to Qualcomm. Twenty years

ago nobody ever heard of them. They got a small grant from this program and they were one of the winners. We were winners too, not just the company, because now they employ 17,800 people operating in more than 30 countries worldwide. They paid in taxes in 1 year half of the cost of this entire program.

As the doctor who researched this program said to us in our hearing—we have five new members of our committee from the Republican side and Senator SNOWE and I wanted to give them a chance to understand this bill. I am proud to say all but one supported it coming out of committee when they understood—of course, some of them had served in the House before and were familiar with this. But when they understood that this has been one of the most successful programs, and when it was reviewed by—I think it was Dr. Wessner who gave us a review of the program, he said, Let me tell you, Senator: If every single grant produces a company, you are running the wrong kind of program. Because this is a high-risk effort, but it is a risk that over time has paid off tremendously to the taxpayer and will continue if it continues to run in that fashion.

We have tightened up fraud and abuse statutes in this bill. We have put in more oversight, which Senator SNOWE and I thought was important, not to heavily burden the program but to make sure the people in our Departments, whether it is in Defense or NIH or the NASA program, are utilizing this program to the extent and with the spirit Congress intends. So we have made some adjustments, some perfection through some adjustments and modifications, and we think we have made this program hopefully even stronger.

Not every grant that is given will result in jobs, and it will be folded. But when it works, it works, and we are so benefited as a nation. In fact, there was also testimony given before our committee that countries all over the world are trying to model some of their programs after this one. They keep asking: How is it in America you have such an innovative spirit? How is it you start so many small businesses, and many of them—not all—succeed? What is it?

It is a number of things. It is our own nature and spirit. It is also because people have traditionally had a variety of accesses to capital, whether it is equity in their homes or a savings account or a banking system that is for the most part very honest and transparent. We have had some difficulties in the past few years with some of the antics on Wall Street that caused people to catch their breath. Generally, compared to many other countries in the world, our people have access to those things—private property they own. In many countries people can't even own private property. They can't even get a clear title to property, so how can they borrow against it to start a business? They don't.

There are many things that go into this miracle we call the American economy, and this is a big part of it. The Federal Government doesn't do it all. But I am hoping, as people consider this debate, every State in the Union will create a similar program. Some of them already have. I will try to provide to all the Members here a list of what their individual States have done. Because if we think about it, the large cities, whether it be New York or San Francisco or Detroit or Chicago—if every city government would think about setting aside a small portion of some of their research and development money to push out the small businesses that aren't obvious sometimes to Wall Street and New York or they are not obvious to Pennsylvania Avenue and Washington or they are not exactly located in the Silicon Valley in California, but there are budding entrepreneurs and Americans with great ideas and great drive and great determination—I am hoping our government can be smarter. I would like the Federal Government to be as smart as it can possibly be, and I am hoping our State governments will look at this program as a model and, potentially, cities.

I can tell my colleagues one thing I am very excited about. I haven't talked with them about it specifically, but I have spoken at some length to the Goldman Sachs executives, and I wish to speak for a minute about a program I am very impressed with. It is not something we are doing. It is something they are doing, but I think it is worth mentioning here.

Goldman Sachs has decided to try to create 10,000 new small businesses in America—not new small businesses. They are trying to grow 10,000 small businesses in America. They have a very strategic plan and one I am watching very closely for a number of reasons. One, their model is scaleable and other companies could potentially do it and maybe we could model some kind of Federal program, if theirs is successful.

Secondly, I am watching it closely because one of the cities they chose for their pilot is the City of New Orleans, the city I represent. My brother serves as mayor there now. He is very engaged with the leadership there, because New Orleans has become a hotbed of innovation. When I hear President Obama talking about out-competing and out-innovating, that is not going to happen on Pennsylvania Avenue or right down on the intersection of M and Wisconsin in Georgetown. It is going to happen on Canal Street and in the lower ninth ward in New Orleans east, in Gentilly, and places all over the world.

Goldman Sachs is saying, All right, Mr. Mayor, you get the city leadership and one of the community colleges to get the training. We jointly choose these entrepreneurs that have promise—they are already established and they have proven they can run a business and they can turn a profit, but

they are stagnating. They are smaller. They have the potential to be larger, but they are not. What is it that is causing this? Maybe lack of knowledge, lack of capital. Our Delgado Community College—and I am very proud of Delgado. It is one of the finest community colleges in the country. Delgado stepped up and said, Let us put them through the training. When they succeed and successfully exit the training—and I believe it is a 6-month to 9-month program—at the other end, Goldman Sachs gives them a check for X amount of money. I am not sure if it is \$25,000 or \$100,000 or \$200,000. I will get that into the RECORD so we can be clear. But they give them a check so they have the capital and know-how and then they have the support of some of the nonprofits in the area to help them grow.

Think about that. If that is something only one company is doing, think about what companies such as Chevron—and I see them advertising—what they are doing to help small business. I think about other companies. American Express with their Plum card, if I am correct, talks about what they are doing. I am not promoting these companies, but they are examples of programs that are out there supporting small business. The Federal Government can do its part as well, and we have an obligation. We can't do everything, but we most certainly can do our part, as many large companies around the country and the world are also thinking about what they can do to help grow small businesses in their area. That is just one example.

We are going to watch the success of some of these programs in the private sector, and then we will get some of their best ideas and potentially even strengthen our partnership. But this is a partnership between the Federal Government and private small businesses throughout our country.

Let me switch for a minute to mention a couple of the organizations that are supporting this program. I don't see anyone on the floor at this time to speak, so let me read into the RECORD again some of the comments we have received from very strong organizations.

The Small Business Technology Council says:

Not only does this SBIR program spur technological innovation and entrepreneurship, it helps create high-tech jobs and does so without increasing the Federal deficit.

The National Small Business Association says:

The uncertain future of this program—

and as I said, for 6 years it has been operating on short-term arrangements: 3 months here, 2 months there. For 6 years, nobody has had any idea, either from the private sector, from some of the best labs, from our agencies, whether this program would be there next week. That is unconscionable. That is why Senator SNOWE and I have fought so hard to get this program authorized.

I see Senator COBURN on the floor, the Senator from Oklahoma, and I wish to thank him, because as a result of his good compromising efforts with us last Congress we will be able to authorize this program for 8 years, as the Senator will know, because he has been a strong advocate for good management and streamlining. Programs such as this need certainty. The labs, our agencies need to know. We are looking out 2 years or 3 years for this new technology, but if there is a company out here we think could provide it to us, we need to know. So this 8-year authorization is important. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma, because some programs are only authorized for 4 years or 5 years. But we feel because we have been in limbo for 6 years, it would be a good idea to get an 8-year authorization.

One more comment for 30 seconds and I will yield the floor. I wish to read into the RECORD the letters of support from a short list of companies, and as additional ones come in we will read into the RECORD their support:

The Bay Area Innovation Alliance has sent their support. The Bio District of New Orleans, the Biotechnology Industry Organization, Connect of California, the National Defense Industrial Association, the New England Innovation Alliance, the National Small Business Association, the National Venture Capital Association, the Small Business Association of New England—and I wish to thank Senator SHAHEEN particularly for her support—Small Businesses of California, Small Business Technology Council, V-Labs, Inc./ American Chemical Society, and the United States Chamber of Commerce, to name a few.

Let's keep this debate moving forward. We have had a number of amendments today. I see Senator COBURN on the floor.

I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the chairwoman for her kind words. It is necessary that we move this bill, I agree. I am thankful to Senator LANDRIEU and the ranking member for the movement on some of the commitments they made to me on programs that don't work within the small business area.

I have multiple amendments, but in due deference to the chairwoman, I will not call those up. I am going to call up two. I wish to explain both of them.

Amendment No. 184. Everybody was excited about the GAO report that looked at the first third of the Federal Government in terms of all the duplication. We don't know the extent of that duplication, and we are going to have to do some hard work to winnow out a lot of savings, but there are a lot of savings. People don't agree with me on my estimate, but nobody knows these programs better than I do. I have been studying them for 6 years. There is at least \$100 billion where we can

save the American taxpayers and actually do a better job through redesigning the programs and eliminating the bureaucracies that make them less than effective.

So one of the things we need to do to help GAO is have the agencies report to OMB and to us on a yearly basis on their programs. There are at least 2,100 programs that we know of in the Federal Government. When GAO looks at this, it is very difficult for them to ferret it all out. We only have one agency that publishes a list of their programs every year, and that is the Department of Education. The book is very thick, and it lists all their programs. That will make it much easier for GAO to do the next third.

This is a simple amendment that requires every department of the Cabinet to fulfill to OMB, within a short period of time, all their programs and also report to us. When that happens that will make GAO much more effective in how it brings to us this next group of duplications. So it is a straightforward amendment. I hope it can be accepted.

AMENDMENT NO. 184

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 184 and make it pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. LANDRIEU. There is no objection. But before we do that, I ask the Senator a question. I actually like this amendment, No. 184. The Senator spoke with me about this previously. It has some merit. I thank the Senator for being cooperative.

If he could identify his other number, I would like to suggest that if we can get a Democratic amendment slid in between these, we might call up his two and the Democratic one.

Mr. COBURN. The other amendment is No. 220.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Would the Senator mind explaining that amendment, and I will make sure it is cleared on our side and we will see what we can do.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I understand my first amendment is up and pending; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 184.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a list of programs administered by every Federal department and agency)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. ____ . REQUIREMENT TO IDENTIFY AND DESCRIBE PROGRAMS.

(a) Each fiscal year, the head of each Federal agency shall—

(1) identify and describe every program administered by the agency, including the mis-

sion, goals, purpose, budget, and statutory authority of each program;

(2) report the list and description of programs to the Office of Management and Budget, Congress, and the U.S. Government Accountability Office; and

(3) post the list and description of programs on the agency's public website.

(b) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prescribe regulations to implement this section.

(c) This section shall be implemented beginning in the first full fiscal year occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 220

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I will discuss amendment No. 220 now. Is the chairman's intention that I defer calling up that amendment right now?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I may not have an objection. We are trying to get it cleared on our side. If the Senator will explain it, we can get back to him in short order.

Mr. COBURN. Amendment No. 220 is about making sure we don't send good money after bad. When you go to the pump today to buy gasoline that is blended with ethanol, you pay, as a taxpayer, \$1.78. As a taxpayer, you pay that before you ever pay the \$3.51 we are paying per gallon, through incentives, tax credits, and rebates for ethanol and blending.

This doesn't take away incentives on corn-based ethanol. It says that because we already have a mandate that says 15 billion gallons of ethanol must be available and put through the system this year, no longer is there a necessity to have a blender's credit to the tune of \$6 billion a year. So what this does is two things: One, it takes away an incentive that is no longer needed because we have already mandated the ethanol will be there. But it saves us \$6 billion that we are paying to firms that are going to do the business whether we pay it or not.

So it is silly to continue to spend \$6 billion of American taxpayer money of which almost \$3 billion of it will be borrowed money from either the Federal Reserve or from the Chinese to incentivize something that is already mandated to happen.

If we look at ethanol, it is two-thirds as efficient when blended as gasoline. It gets poorer mileage, and there is no savings in terms of carbon output or pollution. So we are incentivizing the use of a fuel that goes against what most people would like to do environmentally. It causes us to markedly increase the cost of food, which we are seeing in our country and around the world today, and we are incentivizing something that is going to happen anyway.

So it is a straightforward amendment. It says on the blender's tax credit we are no longer going to give a credit for something on which we already have a market—we are going to do without it. Some will say that is a tax increase. But when we send \$6 billion to a small segment of American industry, and it is not going to impact

their sales at all, what is the purpose for having tax credits? If we use tax credits or expenditures to expand the economy and it is not doing that, why would we continue to do it?

As part of the President's deficit commission, we looked at that and said it is a no-brainer. There is no reason we would incent something that is already mandated by law and has to happen. I know it is a controversial subject for a lot of my colleagues from farm States. But the fact is, worldwide sophistication and food preference has markedly increased. This is creating an enormous pressure in taking food stocks out of the human food chain and putting it into the energy chain. So we are not stopping that. There are still all the other credits available, incentives and mandates. But we are saying we should not spend \$6 billion of American taxpayer money that we don't have—by the way, we do not have it—for something they are going to do anyway.

The other point I make is that we are now a net exporter of ethanol. A lot of people don't recognize that. Through November 2010, we exported 397 million gallons of ethanol. That is almost 1 billion gallons since 2005. Not counting the blender's credit but all the other credits, we are supporting that to the tune of \$1.20 a gallon.

Now we are subsidizing the consumption of ethanol in Europe to the tune of \$1.20 a gallon. That makes no sense when, in fact, we have significant energy needs ourselves.

My hope is that we will consider this amendment and that we will vote on it. I recognize it is going to be a close vote. My count is at 55, and I know we have to get 60. I want the other 45 Members of our body to go and explain to their constituents why we are sending \$6 billion to something that is going to happen anyway. It is a gift. That is all it is. We don't have \$6 billion to spend that way.

The other point I will make is that with the trouble we are in, we are not going to get out of it by cutting \$200 billion at a time. We are going to get out of it \$6 billion at a time. Senator BEGICH and I found \$1 billion in the FAA bill from earmarks that are tied up. So if we do it \$1 billion, \$2 billion, \$3 billion, \$4 billion, \$5 billion, or \$6 billion at a time, pretty soon it will add up and we will take pressure off our country in terms of funding our debt.

The ultimate course has to be to convince the world that we get it, that we can't continue to borrow 40 percent of our expenditures in the world financial market and expect them to continue to loan us money. It is very straightforward.

My corn farmers in Oklahoma don't like it, and I understand that. It is about doing the right thing for our country. Now is the time to do it.

I yield the floor.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Oklahoma. We have been able to

get his amendment No. 184 pending in the list of seven others, which gives us eight pending but not yet set for a vote. If he would allow me to get back to him about whether I will be able to clear that, I would appreciate it. Senator SNOWE is not on the floor, and we need to consult with her.

The number of the Senator's other amendment is 220. I will let him know within the hour about that.

Senator SHAHEEN is here. I appreciate her letting me say—and she will ask to be recognized—that she has been an outstanding member of our Small Business Committee. She most certainly was the job creator in chief in New Hampshire and has brought a tremendous amount of expertise to the Senate. I am very pleased to have her input on many of these bills that come out of our committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, for those nice words and also for her leadership. We are all indebted to Senator LANDRIEU and Ranking Member SNOWE for their leadership of the Small Business Committee and in bringing forward this legislation before us, the small business innovation research program.

They worked very hard in the last session of Congress to get this bill through the Senate, and it would have passed then except the House adjourned before taking it up. I am thrilled that we are getting back to it this early in this session.

I think most of us recognize that our future economic prosperity depends on whether this country continues to be a leader in science and innovation. We can't compete with India, China, and other Third World countries for low-wage manufacturing jobs. That is not our future. America's future is to be the global leader in science and technology. America makes the best, most innovative products and services. That ingenuity and excellence is our chief economic strength as a nation.

As a former small business owner, I understand it is the private sector and business, and not government, that is responsible for most of the job creation in this country. But I also understand that government has a critical role to play in fostering the positive business climate that we need in this country to remain competitive. I believe there are a few things we can do through policy to unleash the innovative spirit that is so alive and well throughout this country, and particularly in my State of New Hampshire.

One of those policy initiatives that we can do that is essential in maintaining the creative dominance that has allowed us to lead the world in innovation is to enact a long-term reauthorization of the Small Business Innovation Research Program or the SBIR Program.

SBIR is not just a typical grant program. Under the SBIR Program, a small business is able to compete for research that Federal agencies need to accomplish their mission—agencies such as the Department of Defense. Small businesses employ about one-third of America's scientists and engineers and produce more patents than large businesses and universities. Yet small business receives only about 4 percent of Federal research and development dollars.

SBIR ensures that small business gets a tiny fraction of the existing Federal research dollars. Just in the last few weeks, I visited three New Hampshire companies that are doing cutting edge research because of the SBIR Program. Those three are Airex in Somersworth, Spire Semiconductor in Hudson, and Active Shock in Manchester. The research they have done under the SBIR Program has allowed them to develop new products, to add customers, and hire new workers—in other words, create jobs. All three have done essential research for the Department of Defense.

Airex, for example, has developed a state-of-the-art program to manufacture critical components for our Nation's strategic missiles. This SBIR award positioned them perfectly to compete and win a contract to manufacture motors for use in military programs and to commercialize their research. They have been able to expand from a workforce of 10 to, currently, 25 workers since they got that SBIR award, and they are continuing to grow.

In Hanover, we have a company called Creare that is a poster child for the economic benefit that can be reaped through the SBIR Program. Senator LANDRIEU has talked on the floor about Qualcomm in San Diego. We should put Creare in Hanover, NH, in the same category as Qualcomm.

Creare can trace more than \$670 million of revenues they have earned because of the SBIR Program, its spin-offs, and technology licensees for the commercialization of its SBIR projects.

Many New Hampshire small businesses have successfully competed for SBIR funding in the 28 years since the program has been in existence. All across New Hampshire, small businesses that otherwise would not be able to compete for Federal R&D funding have won competitive SBIR grants that advance technology and science and create good jobs—what we all want to happen right now in this economy.

In just the last 2 years, New Hampshire firms have won 80 SBIR awards, and, in fact, despite its small size, New Hampshire is ranked 22nd in the country for the total grants awarded through the Department of Defense under the SBIR Program.

As a Senator from New Hampshire, I take particular pride in the SBIR Program because it was New Hampshire Senator Warren Rudman who, back in

1982, sponsored the Small Business Innovation Development Act which established the SBIR Program.

SBIR has a proven track record and its cost, as Chair LANDRIEU has said so often on the floor, is minimal. CBO estimates that implementing this bill would cost only \$150 million over the next 5 years, and most of that minimal cost would have zero impact on the budget. That is because what this bill does is establish a 3-year pilot program that authorizes participating agencies to use the same dollars they set aside anyway for SBIR research to pay for administrative costs. That means we will not be using general operating funds to pay for administrative costs, and this bill imposes no mandates on business and imposes no costs on State and local governments.

We need to address the long-term deficit and debt in this country. Our colleague from Oklahoma just spoke very eloquently to the need to do that and what it is going to take. We all know that. But the best way we can start dealing with the debt and deficit is through more robust economic growth. Objecting to the SBIR Program, as some have done, on the grounds that we should be focusing on the deficit alone makes no sense at all because the jobs created by the SBIR Program will lower the deficit.

Just like stopgap budgeting is bad for business, so are stopgap extensions of the SBIR Program. Unfortunately, SBIR has been operating under short-term extensions—10 of them—since 2008. Short-term extensions are a problem because, as I hear and I know we all hear regularly from businesses—they need certainty in planning. This bill reauthorizes the SBIR Program for 8 years. It is a reasonable period of time, and it will allow small businesses and Federal agencies to effectively plan their research.

I know we have heard from some quarters and it has become fashionable on the part of some people to say that this country's best days are behind us. But I do not believe that for one moment. As I have traveled around New Hampshire, I see cutting-edge innovators who are creating jobs. We in the Senate know what needs to be done. We just need the will to do it.

I urge all our colleagues to join Senator LANDRIEU, Ranking Member SNOWE, and the Small Business Committee in voting to reauthorize and strengthen the SBIR Program.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK BUCKLES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, we are waiting 10 or 15 minutes for Senators to come to the floor to speak

about the bill. Senator SNOWE, myself, and others have fairly described it for hours today and yesterday. I thought I would take a minute to pay honor to a gentleman, the last U.S. veteran of World War I, who was laid to rest in Arlington Cemetery just yesterday and to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article. I would like to read as much of it as I am able before the other Members come because it struck me as something important. It is a beautifully written article in the Post this morning. I hope many people got to see it. I am hoping many of our Members are able to read it. I learned some things I had actually no idea about, which will become apparent as I read this short article. It was beautifully written by Paul Duggan.

I thought I would take a minute to read it into the RECORD. This is the last U.S. veteran of World War I so, of course, it was not just any ordinary funeral—not that any funeral is ordinary. It was extremely special to our country and to the world. President Obama was in attendance. Vice President JOE BIDEN was in attendance. I would like to read as much of it as I can:

A lowly corporal of long ago was buried Tuesday at Arlington National Cemetery, ushered to his grave with all the Army's Old Guard solemn pomp.

Frank Woodruff Buckles lived to be 110, the last of nearly 5 million U.S. veterans of a dimly remembered war—a generation now laid to rest.

In a late-day chill, after hundreds of strangers had paid their respects in public viewings since the weekend, soldiers carried the former doughboy's flag-draped coffin partway up a knoll and set it on polished rails above his plot, a stone's toss from the grave of his old supreme commander, Gen. John J. "Blackjack" Pershing.

A chaplain commended his soul to God; rifle volleys cracked; a bugler sounded taps below the gentle rise. With flags at half-staff throughout the U.S. military and government, it was a fine send-off for the country's last known veteran of World War I, who died peacefully Feb. 27 in his West Virginia farmhouse.

Yet the hallowed ritual at grave No. 34-581 was not a farewell to one man alone. A reverent crowd of the powerful and the ordinary—President Obama and Vice President Biden, laborers and store clerks, heads bowed—came to salute Buckles's deceased generation, the vanished millions soldiers and sailors he came to symbolize in the end.

Who were they? Not the troops of "the Greatest Generation," so celebrated these days, but the unheralded ones of 1917 and 1918, who came home to pats on the back and little else in an era before the country embraced and rewarded its veterans. Their 20th-century narrative, poignant and meaningful, is seldom recalled.

"I know my father would want me to be here," said Mike Oliver, 73, a retiree from Alexandria, leaning on a cane near the cemetery's amphitheater hours before the burial. Inside, a hushed procession of visitors filed past Buckles's closed coffin in the chapel.

"I'm here for Mr. Buckles, and I'm here for what he represents," Oliver said. On his left lapel, he wore a tiny gold pin, the insignia of his long-dead father's infantry division in World War I, the Army's 80th. "I'm here to say goodbye to my dad," he said.

Buckles, who fibbed his way into the Army at 16, was a rear-echelon ambulance driver in

war-ravaged France, miles behind the battlefront. More than 116,000 Americans died, about half in the fighting, most of the rest from illnesses, in the nation's 19-month long engagement in a conflict that scorched Europe for four years.

Now the veterans who survived are all gone. What's left is remembrance—the collective story of 4.7 million lives, an obituary for a generation.

Arriving stateside in 1918 and 1919, many of them, scarred in mind and limb, they were met by postwar recession and joblessness.

A lot of veterans thought that they were owed a boost, that they ought to be compensated for the good civilian wages they had missed. But—

Unfortunately, my words—

lawmakers, year after year, said no.

"Oh, the YMCA did give me a one-month free membership," Buckles recalled when he was a very old fellow. Except for the \$60 most veterans got from the government when they mustered out, the YMCA gift was "the only consideration I ever saw given to a soldier after the war," the last doughboy said.

What he and other veterans finally received, in 1924, were bonus certificates redeemable for cash in 1945. And Congress had to override a veto to secure even that.

With the 1920s roaring by then, the young veterans tucked away their certificates and went about their lives. Buckles became a purser on merchant ships, traveling the globe.

Then the Depression hit, and their generation's legacy took on another aspect, one of activism that helped propel a reshaping of the nation's social landscape.

Thousands of ruined veterans were left with nothing of value but the promise of eventual bonuses. In 1932, while Buckles was at sea, a ragtag army of ex-servicemen descended on Washington with their wives and kids to lobby for early redemption of the certificates, and a disaster ensued that would long reverberate.

This is the part I had no idea about, and I think it is important to recall it, to remember it:

Living for weeks in a sprawling shantytown on mud flats in the Anacostia and in tents and hovels near the U.S. Capitol, the dirt poor "Bonus Army," numbering more than 20,000, defied orders to disperse. So the White House unleashed the military.

Infantrymen, saber-wielding cavalry troops and a half-dozen tanks swept along the avenues below the Capitol, routing the veterans and their families in a melee of blood and tear gas. Then soldiers cleared out the Anacostia shacks and set them ablaze.

Two veterans died, and hundreds were injured. Four years later, after a Florida hurricane killed 259 destitute veterans at a makeshift federal work camp, political support finally tipped for the bonuses, and the generation that fought World War I finally got a substantial benefit.

"I think mine was \$800," Buckles said of his bonus, equal of \$12,000 today. He said he gave it to his father, an Oklahoma Dust Bowl farmer barely hanging on.

The Bonus Army debacle weighed on Congress and the Roosevelt administration during World War II. With 16 million Americans in uniform—more than three times the World War I total—policymakers feared massive unrest if the new veterans got the same shabby treatment that Buckles' generation had received.

The result, in 1944, was the GI Bill, widely viewed as the most far-reaching social program in U.S. history.

I underscore that to say widely viewed as the most far-reaching social program in world history.

It made college and homeownership possible for the great wave of returning World War II veterans, when such opportunities were considered luxuries, and spurred a vast, decades-long expansion of America's middle class.

Unfortunately for the veterans of Buckles's era, the bill wasn't retroactive.

Tuesday's hours-long viewing in the amphitheater chapel was a consolation. Buckles's family and members of West Virginia's congressional delegation had wanted him to lie in honor in the Capitol Rotunda.

They wanted him to lie in honor here, but it was not to be permissible.

So the people of Arlington came to say goodbye.

The article continues:

A generation's end.

When Murial Sue Kerr met Buckles—

This was his wife—

in the 1970s, she was a secretary at the Alexandria headquarters of Veterans of World War I of the USA, which had a large office staff at the time, scores of chapters across the country and a quarter-million members out of 750,000 surviving veterans of the war.

"The commander," Kerr calls Buckles, who got that title in 2008 when the only other living member, a Florida man, passed away.

The group was formed in 1948 after millions of World War II veterans swelled the ranks of the American Legion and similar organizations.

It goes on to quote Kerr:

"The World War II guys had business loans, home loans, education, all kinds of things," she said. "My World War I guys? Nothing. So they said, 'Okay . . . we'll go start our own bunch.'"

Which included Buckles, who had been captured by the Japanese while working in Manila at the outbreak of hostilities in the Pacific. Although he spent World War II in an enemy prison camp, he was a civilian, so the GI Bill didn't extend to him.

In 1974, when Kerr was hired, most of the men were retirees.

She said:

"Every year they'd come to Washington, bus loads of them, and testify before Congress," she recalled. They wanted money for eyeglasses, hearing aids, dentures. "And a little pension," she said. "Good ol' H.R. 1918—it was a bill they were always putting in to give them \$50 a month. But, of course, it never, ever passed."

Just lot of memoirs now—the lobbying, the quarterly magazine, the big annual conventions in Hot Springs and Daytona Beach. Time ran out for all but the heartiest of the Veterans of World War I of the USA, and they died fast. By 1993, when the office shut for good, Kerr, then in her 40s, was the only staff member left.

And occasionally she got phone calls from some of the few remaining members, whose frail voices broke her heart.

"The typical sad things you'll hear from the elderly," she said. "I had one of my guys, he was absolutely in tears. He was from Nevada, and his new nurse wouldn't cut the crust off of his sandwich."

They were buried with honors Tuesday as scores of somber onlookers crowded the hillside, a distant generation borne to the grave with the last old veteran, who was cared for lovingly by his family to the end.

In the waning afternoon, the soldiers of the burial detail strode in formation up the avenue from the grand marble amphitheater to Section 34 of the cemetery, escorting the horse-drawn caisson with Buckles's metal coffin, the procession slow and deliberate, like the march of time.

After the prayer and the echoes of the bugle and the rifles had faded, the Army's vice chief of staff, Gen. Peter W. Chiarelli, knelt before Buckles's daughter, seated by the grave, and handed her a tri-folded American flag. He whispered words of comfort, then stood and walked away.

No more doughboys now.

So long. Rest in peace.

Madam President, I thought this was an article worth entering into the RECORD. I am pleased I had the time today, before Senators came to the floor, to actually read it into the RECORD so that we could pause to remember this week the burial of the last veteran of World War I and what an obligation we have to our veterans today and the kind of determination that we must continue to foster to honor them for the sacrifices they make, whether it was this generation, which we in large measure failed to do, the veterans of World War II, the veterans of Vietnam and Korea, of course, Desert Storm, our veterans from Iraq and from Afghanistan who are currently fighting those battles. It helps us to remember that the important work we do here—the bills passing, particularly bills that provide these kinds of fair and equitable benefits—is most certainly something the Federal Government must continue to keep as one of its highest priorities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 229

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I am sorry for the delay, but we wanted to make sure we had our i's dotted and our t's crossed.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to call up and make pending the Pryor amendment numbered 229, the Patriot Express loan program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] proposes an amendment numbered 229.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish the Patriot Express Loan Program under which the Small Business Administration may make loans to members of the military community wanting to start or expand small business concerns, and for other purposes)

On page 116, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 504. PATRIOT EXPRESS LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a)(31) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(31)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) PATRIOT EXPRESS LOAN PROGRAM.—

“(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘eligible member of the military community’—

“(I) means—

“(aa) a veteran, including a service-disabled veteran;

“(bb) a member of the Armed Forces on active duty who is eligible to participate in the Transition Assistance Program;

“(cc) a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces;

“(dd) the spouse of an individual described in item (aa), (bb), or (cc) who is alive;

“(ee) the widowed spouse of a deceased veteran, member of the Armed Forces, or member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who died because of a service-connected (as defined in section 101(16) of title 38, United States Code) disability; and

“(ff) the widowed spouse of a deceased member of the Armed Forces or member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces relating to whom the Department of Defense may provide for the recovery, care, and disposition of the remains of the individual under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 1481(a) of title 10, United States Code; and

“(II) does not include an individual who was discharged or released from the active military, naval, or air service under dishonorable conditions.

“(ii) LOAN GUARANTEES.—The Administrator shall establish a Patriot Express Loan Program, under which the Administrator may guarantee loans under this paragraph made by express lenders to eligible members of the military community.

“(iii) LOAN TERMS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this clause, a loan under this subparagraph shall be made on the same terms as other loans under the Express Loan Program.

“(II) USE OF FUNDS.—A loan guaranteed under this subparagraph may be used for any business purpose, including start-up or expansion costs, purchasing equipment, working capital, purchasing inventory, or purchasing business-occupied real estate.

“(III) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The Administrator may guarantee a loan under this subparagraph of not more than \$1,000,000.

“(IV) GUARANTEE RATE.—The guarantee rate for a loan under this subparagraph shall be the greater of—

“(aa) the rate otherwise applicable under paragraph (2)(A);

“(bb) 85 percent for a loan of not more than \$500,000; and

“(cc) 80 percent for a loan of more than \$500,000.”

(2) GAO REPORT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “programs” means—

(i) the Patriot Express Loan Program under section 7(a)(31)(G) of the Small Business Act, as added by paragraph (1); and

(ii) the increased veteran participation pilot program under section 7(a)(33) of the Small Business Act, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on the programs.

(C) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subparagraph (B) shall include—

(i) the number of loans made under the programs;

(ii) a description of the impact of the programs on members of the military community eligible to participate in the programs;

(iii) an evaluation of the efficacy of the programs;

(iv) an evaluation of the actual or potential fraud and abuse under the programs; and

(v) recommendations for improving the Patriot Express Loan Program under section 7(a)(31)(G) of the Small Business Act, as added by paragraph (1).

(b) FEE REDUCTION.—Section 7(a)(18) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(18)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “With respect to” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraph (C), with respect to”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) MILITARY COMMUNITY.—For an eligible member of the military community (as defined in paragraph (31)(G)(i)), the fee for a loan guaranteed under this subsection, except for a loan guaranteed under subparagraph (G) of paragraph (31), shall be equal to 75 percent of the fee otherwise applicable to the loan under subparagraph (A).”

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SMALL BUSINESS ACT.—Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (33); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (34) and (35) as paragraphs (33) and (34), respectively.

(2) SMALL BUSINESS JOBS ACT OF 2010.—Section 1133(b) of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-240; 124 Stat. 2515) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) by striking paragraph (33), as redesignated by section 504(c) of the SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2011; and

“(2) by redesignating paragraph (34), as redesignated by section 504(c) of the SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2011, as paragraph (33).”

(d) REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENT PRINTING COSTS.—

(1) STRATEGY AND GUIDELINES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall coordinate with the heads of the Executive departments and independent establishments, as those terms are defined in chapter 1 of title 5, United States Code—

(A) to develop a strategy to reduce Government printing costs during the 10-year period beginning on September 1, 2011; and

(B) to issue Government-wide guidelines for printing that implements the strategy developed under subparagraph (A).

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In developing the strategy under paragraph (1)(A), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the heads of the Executive departments and independent establishments shall consider guidelines for—

(i) duplex and color printing;

(ii) the use of digital file systems by Executive departments and independent establishments; and

(iii) determine which Government publications might be made available on Government Web sites instead of being printed.

(B) ESSENTIAL PRINTED DOCUMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall ensure that printed versions of documents that the Director determines are essential to individuals entitled to or enrolled for benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or enrolled for benefits under part B of such title, individuals who receive old-age survivors' or disability insurance payments under title II of such Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and other individuals with limited ability to use or access the Internet have access to printed versions of documents that the Director are available after the issuance of the guidelines under paragraph (1)(B).

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I wish to thank Senator LANDRIEU and Senator SNOWE for their efforts to get this bill to the floor, to handle these

amendments, and to show the leadership we need to try to really focus on and emphasize small business.

I am convinced that if we are going to get the full economic recovery we all want to see, the private sector—and especially small business—is going to have to drive that recovery. That brings me to the amendment that I have filed today and that I have called up.

In 2007, there were roughly 25,000 veteran-owned small businesses in my State. So you can do the math on that. There are probably 2 million around the country or more—maybe 3 million veteran-owned small businesses around the country.

In 2007, the SBA created the Patriot Express Pilot Loan Initiative for members of the military community. That is part of the 7(a) program. My amendment would move that Patriot Express loan program from a pilot program to a fully authorized one, and this would ensure that veterans and members of the military community continue to have the ability to access capital when starting a new business or even when operating an existing one.

The Patriot Express pilot program has been a very successful program, issuing close to 7,000 loans valued at \$560 million and increasing veteran participation in the SBA programs. The amendment would make the Patriot Express loan program available to all members of the military community, including Active and non-Active members, veterans, spouses and children, widows and widowers of service-members. It would increase the maximum loan amount from \$500,000 to \$1 million. It would guarantee rates would be 85 percent for loans of \$500,000 or less and 80 percent for loans over \$500,000 up to \$1 million. It would also reduce the fees imposed by the SBA for all veterans to 75 percent of the fees otherwise applicable under the 7(a) and express programs.

This is a way we can really help our men and women in uniform. And one of the reasons I think this particular pilot program has been a success is because obviously these folks are hard-working, they are disciplined, they are well trained, and they are serious because of what they have been through for our country. But also one of the reasons I think this is compelling is that they have given years of their lives to military service. If they are in the Reserve or National Guard, these can be very disruptive years. It is hard for them to get anything going and in some cases hard to maintain a job over a period of years because they are being deployed, they are back and forth doing the training and fulfilling the requirements the country has required of them. So it is a very disruptive time during what otherwise would be potentially strong earning years where they could be really building their businesses.

So this pilot program has been very effective and successful in providing

access to capital, speeding the process along for our men and women in uniform, and we want to encourage small business ownership, we want to encourage that innovation, and I think this is a great way to do it. Again, this is a program that has been on the books, has proven to be successful, and we certainly hope we can move it from a pilot program to a fully authorized program.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I really appreciate the Senator coming to the floor, and I thank him for his help in advancing this bill and supporting many of the proposals.

The ranking member is not on the floor, so until we run this through the other side for review, I am not sure we will be able to support it. But we are looking at it now, and I thank the Senator for offering it.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we are currently, it is my understanding, on my amendment No. 183 to S. 493, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not the pending amendment at this time.

AMENDMENT NO. 183

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent to set the pending amendment aside for the purpose of considering amendment No. 183.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I notice we did not have any speakers here so I thought I would come down. We do have a bill in consideration right now, in process for a vote. It is my understanding there will be a vote on amendment No. 183 in the next perhaps hour or so, maybe in a few minutes.

Let me give a little background on what happened on this, where we are today. Back in the early 1990s we had the Kyoto treaty that was up for consideration. That was during the Clinton administration. The Kyoto treaty was one we looked at and studied here in this Senate. One of the concerns about it was it was assuming we have catastrophic global warming that was due to manmade gases, anthropogenic gases—methane. That assumption everybody thought probably was right, because everybody said it was—until such time as we thought what the cost would be if at that time we would have ratified the Kyoto treaty and lived by its emissions restrictions. The cost would be somewhere between \$300 and \$400 billion. That actually came from the Wharton School.

We looked at that and thought we better look at that pretty closely. Over

some debate we decided, if this treaty came back—which President Clinton signed but had to come to the Senate for ratification—if it came to the Senate for ratification we would not ratify any treaty that had either one of two things—No. 1, would be devastating to our economy and, No. 2, it would not treat developing countries the same as developed countries.

As it turned out, it did both. It is one that only affected the developed countries and, of course, with the reports we had on the cost, it would be very expensive. But that was back in the 1990s.

Starting around the year 2000 and specifically 2003, this was called to our attention at that time. I say to you, Madam President, I was the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee that had jurisdiction. We looked at this and evaluated the science that was behind it as well as we could. The science on which this is predicated came from the United Nations. Actually, in 1988 the IPCC, the International Panel on Climate Change, was formed. This came in the United Nations and the science behind it was pretty much confined to recommendations from the IPCC.

We started getting phone calls from well-respected scientists all over the country and these scientists would say to us that the IPCC is a closed society. They would not let anyone in to offer their judgment unless they agreed that in fact anthropogenic gases were causing catastrophic global warming.

These scientists started piling up until, I believe it was around 2003, we had a couple of hundred of them. I remember standing at this podium and talking on the floor about all the scientists who disagreed with the science of the IPCC. At that time I made a statement that became quite an irritant to a lot of people when I said: The notion that we are having catastrophic global warming due to anthropogenic gases could be the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people.

I remember going to one of the meetings. Every year the United Nations throws a big party. We just had our 15th, I would add. Everyone remembers a year ago it was Copenhagen. This year it was Cancun. Back then, in 2003, it happened to be in Milan, Italy. I was kind of detested by everyone there because everyone else there was saying we have to do something about this catastrophe that was about to hit us.

As the years went by we had bills. We had the bill in 2003, the bill in 2005, the bill in 2007, in 2009, the last one was the Markey-Waxman—Waxman-Markey bill. Each time those who were behind this, seeking to pass some kind of cap-and-trade bill, were fewer every time we voted. The last count there were a total of 30 Members of the Senate who would say they would vote for the last cap-and-trade bill.

The interesting thing about the bill coming up now is that they were unable to pass it legislatively, which is what we should be doing. We should be

handling this through legislation. We tried. We considered it and it went through the process and it failed. Now they are trying to do it through regulations. It has been speculated that the cost to the American people would be even greater if done through the Environmental Protection Agency than if it were done legislatively.

It was not long ago we had a hearing. I have a great deal of respect for President Obama's Director of the Environmental Protection Agency, Lisa Jackson. She testified before our committee live on TV, and I asked the question. I said if we were to pass this—it might have been the Waxman-Markey bill—it doesn't matter, they are all the same. Cap-and-trade is cap-and-trade—it would have cost between \$300 and \$400 billion if we ratified Kyoto and the same would be true of any of the five or six cap-and-trade bills we have defeated since then.

But I said let's say we pass this and have it signed into law. Would this reduce CO₂ emissions? That is the whole idea. CO₂ emissions were supposed to be causing all this. I was very proud of her, because it took a lot of courage to give the response she did. She said in response: No, it wouldn't, because it would only affect the United States of America.

Then I would take it one step further. What would happen if we have cap-and-trade—whether it is by legislation or by regulation, it doesn't matter—what they are going to do is regulate everything that is out there in our society. As I say, the cost would be between \$300 and \$400 billion.

What I do, since I am not as smart as the rest of them around here, when I hear the billions and trillions of dollars, I try to see what does this cost my people in Oklahoma. I did the math, and in Oklahoma, if we take the total number of people who have filed tax returns, and divide it into the amount of taxes this would cost, it would be about \$3,100 per family in my State of Oklahoma.

What do you get if you get it? You get something even the EPA Director said is not going to lower worldwide CO₂ emissions, so you don't get anything for it.

The big vote coming up in a few minutes is on a bill I have introduced, and we have now introduced this as an amendment to this small business bill, that would say to the EPA: You no longer have jurisdiction—which they should not have, and I questioned that they have it in the first place—over the regulation of CO₂.

There is a lot of talk about the Clean Air Act. I was a very strong supporter of the Clean Air Act. Several people who take a different position from me on the vote that is coming up talk about the Clean Air Act and all the wonderful things it has done—and I agree. It has. So I feel strongly about it. We have cleaner air now than we have had in a long period of time. The thing is, it was designed to take care of

six known pollutants. CO₂ was not one, it was not a pollutant. The Court said you do not have to count it as a pollutant but if you want to you can do it. So it was optional to the Environmental Protection Agency and to the government of our country.

They elected to do that. In order to do that they have to have an endangerment finding. An endangerment finding is something that says CO₂ is an endangerment to public health. When the same administrator, Administrator Jackson, was before our committee—and this was right before Copenhagen; this would have been a year ago last December—I can remember making a statement to her, again in the same public meeting: Madam Administrator, I have a feeling when I leave for Copenhagen tomorrow you are going to have an endangerment finding.

I could see a few smiles. I said: If that happens, it has to be based on some science, doesn't it?

She said yes, it does.

What science do you base it on?

Well, primarily the IPCC.

Primarily—this was right before all the Climategate stuff came out, where they saw that they were falsifying science. All the things we found during the mid-1990s about scientists coming in, they were correct after all and they had been cooking the science on this thing. So that is another problem we have that we are faced with.

The way to solve the problem, and I think many of my Democratic friends—many of them said they agree this should be a matter of the legislature and not a matter of the EPA making these decisions. This morning I quoted some of them. I have it right here.

Senator BAUCUS, a Democratic Senator, said:

I mentioned I do not want the EPA writing these regulations. I think it is too much power in the hands of one single agency, but rather climate change should be a matter essentially left to Congress.

I agree with that and it was left to Congress. We considered five or six bills on this.

Senator BEN NELSON, another Democrat from Nebraska, said:

Controlling the levels of carbon emissions is the job of Congress. We don't need EPA looking over Congress' shoulder telling us we are not moving fast enough.

I agree with him. In addition to that, we have eight other Democratic Senators who said essentially the same thing, so I think that is pretty well understood.

One reason I wanted to mention this before the vote takes place, my wife thinks the greatest problem facing America is the price of gas at the pump. My wife is not the only wife around here believing that, I know. She was saying for a long period of time, what causes these things? And it is very easy.

Even my grandkids understand supply and demand. That is taught in elementary schools nowadays. So supply

and demand is at work here. We have supply in the United States of America. We have—and I am going to show you in just a minute—in fact, I will go ahead and do that now because I want everyone who votes on this to understand anyone, Democrat or Republican, who votes against my amendment is voting to increase dramatically the price of gas at the pumps.

The next time we hear someone say we have—this is something you keep hearing, that we have just 3 percent of the oil in this country. I think that is interesting because they say 3 percent of the proven reserves. Well, proven reserves cannot take place until such time as you drill to prove it.

We have Members of the majority, along with the White House, the majority of the Members of the Senate have disallowed us to go out and drill. So if you cannot drill—something like 83 percent of our public lands where we could be drilling for oil, we cannot do it because they will not let us do it. So if they will not let us do it, then there cannot be proven reserves.

But they do have recoverable reserves. Our recoverable reserves right now in America are 135 billion barrels. All we have to do, in order to do that, is go out and take advantage of that and use these recoverable reserves.

With the CRS report that came out—the CRS is something that is recognized as an impartial, bipartisan or nonpartisan study group. They study these things. They said that, as of 1 year ago, the United States of America—now this is very important because the United States of America has the largest recoverable reserves in coal, gas, and oil of any of the nations. There they are right there. These are the reserves of coal—this is all three, isn't it? Fossil fuels. Yes, coal, gas, and oil. There it is. This is the United States of America.

If you add this up, we have more than Saudi Arabia, China, Canada, and Iraq combined. That is what we have. But the problem is, politically, they will not let us drill for it.

I know—and I regret to say this because I was just challenged, but it was true because I was there—21 years ago we had the Exxon Valdez. It was a disaster. It took place up in Prince William Sound. Most people here remember that now. It was an accident where you had a deficient ship that had leaked in that beautiful, pristine water up there.

I went up there. Quite frankly, there are a bunch of the far left who were celebrating that it happened. Why would they celebrate a disaster such as that? They celebrated because they said: We are going to parlay this into stopping oil production on ANWR or on the North Slopes of Alaska.

Well, that is kind of interesting that they are going to parlay that into that. I said: How do you figure that? Because Prince William Sound, the Exxon Valdez, that was a transportation accident. That hit something causing it to break.

Then, I said: If you do away with drilling in America, that means we are going to have to transport it in from foreign countries, and the likelihood of it happening again is far greater. Nonetheless, they said: We are going to use that.

I hate to say this also, but when we had our spill in the gulf not too long ago, a lot of people were saying: Aha, now we are going to stop all drilling, deepwater drilling in the Gulf.

We have tremendous reserves down there in the gulf. While the moratorium was lifted, the administration has only issued one deepwater drilling permit since that happened.

What I am saying is, we have all these reserves out there, and we can do it. I am talking about gas and oil and coal. It is not just the oil and gas, but we have another opportunity out there.

We have talked about oil. We have talked about gas. In oil, if we would just export our own resources, that is what we know is there, the reserves that we have in oil and in gas, it would run this country, in oil and gas, for 90 years. That is our own stuff. That is not from Saudi Arabia. It is not from the Middle East. It is not even from Mexico. That is our stuff.

The same is true with the coal reserves. There is the United States, 28 percent of all the coal reserves. Right now, 50 percent of the power generated in the United States is generated with coal-fired generation, and they are trying to do away with that. So that is a target.

But again, we have these tremendous reserves in the United States—let's not forget—so we can run this country for 100 years on just what we have, except the politicians will not let us go in and recover our own reserves.

Let's not forget about oil shale. Right now oil shale is something—yes, there are several pilot projects to prove the shale's commercial viability. The Green River Formation, located in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah, contains the equivalent of 6 trillion barrels of oil. Let me say that again, 6 trillion barrels of oil. The Department of Energy estimates that of the 6 trillion, approximately 1.38 trillion barrels are potentially recoverable. That is the equivalent of more than five times the oil reserves in Saudi Arabia.

When I made this statement about having all these reserves, more than any other country, I was not counting shale because that is not quite here yet—almost but not quite. Another domestic energy source that could lessen our dependence is methane hydrates. I think everybody knows that. But I did not count that either.

So all these things that we could have counted are not there. But the point is this: We have enough reserves to take care of all the problems we have in this country for the years to come. I look at—some people will come in, and they are well-meaning people, they will say: Well, we have to go to green energy. I am for green energy.

But if you have something that is under development, and it might be 1 year, it might be 20 years or 30 years before it comes, you have to continue to run this machine called America in the meantime. What do we know works and what is available? It is oil, gas, and coal.

Just for a minute, I am going to deviate over there to what has happened in Japan. We just came from a hearing. I am very proud that not just our administration, the President and the Secretary of Energy, but also the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has said that should not affect what we are doing right now. We currently have 12 applications pending. Two of them are pending for almost immediate consideration for nuclear reactors, so that we will get into nuclear. Right now, we only develop about 20 percent of our energy from nuclear. France, for example, does 80 percent. So that is something that is out there.

I would say, in my opinion, as one Member of the Senate, in order to stop, not reduce but stop, our dependence upon the Middle East altogether, all we have to do is keep working on all of the above. I want wind, I want solar, and all that. But I also want those things that are developed and available today—coal, gas, and oil.

You may wonder what I am getting around to with these charts. It is the fact that we have a—everyone admits that the goal of this administration—I am looking for it right now—is to get prices so high, oil and gas so high that we will have to be dependent upon other things.

President Obama said, not long ago: Under this cap and trade—we are talking about it could either be legislative or it could be regulations—“electricity prices would necessarily skyrocket.” Notice he said, “necessarily skyrocket.” His administrator, or the Secretary of Energy, to give you an idea of what is behind this, the high price of gas at the pumps, said—now this is Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy for the Obama administration. He said: “Somehow we have to figure out a way to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe.”

Let me repeat that. “Somehow we have to figure out a way to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe.”

What are the levels in Europe? The United Kingdom, \$7.87 per gallon; Italy, \$7.54; France, \$7.50; Germany, \$7.41. That is the motivation out there to do this. I think we have many others whom we could quote from the administration, but I do not want this to turn into something that gives the appearance that we are just criticizing the administration.

The fact is, we have to do something about developing our own resources. If we do that, we are going to be able to bring down the price—do two things. First of all, for our national security, quit worrying about depending upon the Middle East for our oil. We can

stop that just by developing our own resources. Secondly, go right back to elementary supply and demand. If we can supply the oil and gas and coal, then we will lower the price and lower it dramatically.

Everybody knows that. That is why this vote that is coming up is so important. Because the vote is not just to try to keep us from having between a \$300 and \$400 billion tax increase on the American people that will not accomplish anything. Remember what I said the Administrator of the EPA said—not only that we would stop that kind of a tax increase but also that we can stop the rise of gas at the pump.

So if somebody votes against this amendment, all it does is say that the—which many Democrats, all Republicans and many Democrats agree—we are going to find out how many—the Congress should be the one to address these issues, not the Environmental Protection Agency. So that is what the amendment is all about. Anyone who is going to be voting against the amendment is saying we do not want to develop our own resources. That is one of the most serious problems we are dealing with right now.

We have other problems that have to do with the EPA right now with all the regulations. They have this minimum achievable technology on emissions, on other things such as boilers and other things that would end up increasing the cost to do business. Ultimately, it is the consumer who pays. I actually have a quote I cannot seem to find right now, since I am not using notes, that says we do have the technology to do all these things. Yet we are going to allow this to happen, even though it is not necessary. So we have a big vote coming up. That vote is: Do you think the EPA should regulate the emissions of CO₂ in America or do you think Congress should do it?

If you think the EPA should do it, get ready for a tax increase, because I can assure you, the President is just waiting to sign something that will allow them to continue down the road of overregulating. There is a cost to regulation. I think we all know that. It is one that is huge.

If you look at the regulations we have, I have already mentioned the \$300 to \$400 billion and how that relates to everybody in my State of Oklahoma who files a tax return. The boiler regulation that is coming out right now—the same EPA—that would affect 800,000 jobs in America. The utility MACT—that is something the Director of the EPA just had a news conference on today. The minimum achievable reduction in utilities would cost about \$100 billion. The ozone and the PM would be about \$90 billion.

As I say, we would be talking about a pretty big jobs bill but only on this. I wish to make sure everyone understands. My very good friend, JOHN BARRASSO, a Senator from Wyoming, has a bill that is going to go a lot further than this. I am a strong supporter

of his legislation. It will go into the—keeping the EPA from using CO₂ to change the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act. That is very good. That is not what this is.

I heard something this morning that I want to make sure to clarify because it is important because there are all kinds of things out there people are saying will happen if we pass this amendment.

They are saying that is going to somehow affect—in fact, they said I respectfully asked the members of the committee to keep in mind that EPA's implementation of the Clean Air Act saves millions of American adults and children from debilitating and expensive illnesses that occur when smokestacks and tailpipes release unrestricted amounts of pollution. Yes, I agree with that. But let's keep in mind, I was a strong supporter when the Clean Air Act came out and when the amendments came out.

It was designed for the six criteria pollutants at the heart of the Clean Air Act: lead, ozone, nitrogen oxide, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. These are real pollutants, not imaginary pollutants such as CO₂. But that is what was targeted by the Clean Air Act.

Of course, it has nothing to do with anything else. So those things are still going to be restricted. We have had some people say—and I have heard this several times today—this amendment would block the administration's announced plan to follow up with the Clean Air Act standards for cars and light trucks. This is not at all true. That is all done by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. That is not within the jurisdiction of the EPA. That is NHTSA, they call it.

It has nothing to do with mileage on cars, nothing to do with the whole effort to increase mileage.

EPA is contributing practically nothing to the administration's global warming car deal—about 4 percent of the joint EPA-NHTSA program's emissions reductions. Dropping EPA would, therefore, have a meaningless effect on oil consumption. According to the EPA, its greenhouse gas car standards would mean that “global mean temperature” is reduced by “0.006 to 0.0015 [Celsius] by 2100.”

That is not even measurable. Don't let anyone use the argument that this has anything to do with CAFE standards. It doesn't affect anything that is harmful for people to breathe.

The amendment will be coming up soon. We are going to find out who wants to keep us from developing our own resources. It should be a very interesting vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, the amendment from the Senator from Kentucky seeks to reduce discretionary spending by \$200 billion. The

actual amendment would cut in excess of \$155 billion from domestic discretionary spending programs and the balance from security-related programs. While I am sure the Senator is serious in his desire to cut spending, I would point out to my colleagues that for the remaining 6 months of this fiscal year, with the passage of the next short-term continuing resolution, the Federal Government will have less than \$200 billion in fiscal year 11 funds remaining for domestic discretionary spending.

My colleagues need to be advised that the CR that has passed the House will set a ceiling on domestic discretionary funding for the whole year at \$400 billion. Since we are half way through the fiscal year, we have already allocated approximately half of these resources. Moreover, during the first 6 months of the fiscal year the government was funded at a higher rate, approximately \$405 billion. Therefore, we only have approximately \$195 billion remaining for the balance of the year to spend on all discretionary domestic programs. While there are examples where unobligated balances remain in some agencies, in general it is fair to say the Senator's amendment would cut this year's remaining domestic spending by 80 percent.

The amendment stipulates that the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting are all abolished. If this wasn't bad enough, the amendment would also cut more funding from the Department of Education than they have remaining for the balance of the fiscal year. It would cut more than remains available for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and from the Office of Personnel Management.

Some domestic agencies would have sufficient resources to survive this cut, but none without dire consequences.

A cut of 35 percent to the EPA would seriously curtail funding for sewer and drinking water infrastructure, while leaving the agency with little funding to pay its personnel for the balance of the fiscal year.

For the Department of the Interior, the Paul amendment would almost certainly necessitate the closure of our national parks and Indian schools.

On security funding, the bill would slash the State Department's budget 75 percent below last year's level, effectively eliminating funding for most State Department functions worldwide with devastating consequences for ongoing operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

The \$30 billion cut to the Department of Defense would likely delay or terminate procurement programs supported by the Congress as the Department uses its authority to target cuts away from readiness and personnel programs toward investment programs.

The Energy Department's nuclear weapons program would be cut by \$2.5

billion. This would put the safety, security and reliability of our nuclear weapons at risk.

The only thing that many agencies would be able to do if they were faced with cuts of this magnitude would be to plan their shut down operations.

Not a single Member of this Chamber can responsibly vote for this amendment.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 216

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to speak about an amendment I have offered and we will be voting on in a little while. It is amendment No. 216, and it is a basic, very simple amendment, but it will rectify or remedy a problem we have in our contracting.

We have all kinds of businesses across the country that are part of the contracting process. But often when we have prime contractors who will have the opportunity to bid on Federal work, they will list subcontractors in their application. In some cases those subcontractors happen to be minority-owned firms and women-owned firms, known, of course, by the acronyms MBE and WBE. So the prime contractors will list them to make their applications more competitive, without informing—this is where the problem comes in—without informing the subcontractor.

This amendment does two basic things, and it is an amendment all of about 13 lines when we get to the heart of it. Basically, what it requires in these instances is that the prime contractor notify the subcontractor. That is part one. Part two is, in these instances where there may be an allegation of fraud or other problems the subcontractor wants to report, the Administrator, in this case, will establish a reporting mechanism that allows that subcontractor to report fraudulent activity by the contractor.

So two very basic elements: a notification provision, so if you are a firm that is listed on paperwork a prime contractor files, you be notified of that—that is No. 1—and, in addition to the notification of the subcontractor, that the Administrator set up a program, a method where you can report fraudulent activity by the contractor.

It is that simple. At a time when we are trying to create jobs and support small businesses across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and across the country, I think it is a very basic change that needs to be made.

So I commend the work Chairman LANDRIEU has done on this bill and her leadership but in particular her support for this amendment.

I yield to Senator LANDRIEU.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Pennsylvania being so supportive and so helpful. I think this is an amendment we can support. I am hoping to get clarification to actually go to a vote on this amendment sometime in the next 20 minutes or so. We do not have that cleared at this point, but we are hoping to be able to vote on this amendment.

I would like to ask the Presiding Officer, though, to read the pending amendments just by number and name because I think we have seven or eight pending amendments. Could the Presiding Officer clarify what amendments are currently pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendments are No. 183, a McConnell amendment; No. 178, a Vitter amendment; No. 161, an Inhofe for Johanns amendment; No. 216, a Landrieu for Casey amendment; No. 186, a Cornyn amendment; No. 199, a Paul amendment; No. 207, a Sanders amendment; No. 197, a Hutchison amendment; No. 184, a Coburn amendment; and, finally, No. 229, a Pryor amendment.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President. That is what our records show.

I appreciate all these Members being very patient. We have their amendments pending. We are going to try to line up votes for them, hopefully, sometime either later tonight or tomorrow.

We also have a few other Members who have said they would like to have their amendments considered. I would simply ask if they can come down to the floor. Tonight would be a good time because we have had a very good, open, encompassing debate on a variety of different issues. Of course, the underlying bill before us is the reauthorization of the SBIR and STTR Programs that have been operating on a very short term with very ineffectual authorizations that do not allow these programs to have the benefit for taxpayers they deserve. So we have struggled now for 6 years, three Congresses. It is time to get this done.

So while we have many, many amendments that have been filed, I am happy to report that there are probably just a few more Members who want to actually come and speak on their amendments. Some have said: We will take up our amendments on a later day. Many of the Members who have filed five and six amendments have said: I am only going to go with one, Senator LANDRIEU and Senator SNOWE.

We are very grateful for everyone's cooperation.

So, hopefully, we can vote on the Casey amendment tonight, and then have a queue of other amendments potentially in this order or some revision of this order. But all those pending will be, of course, provided an opportunity

for a vote. We do have some outstanding questions about one of the Coburn amendments we have not cleared on either side.

So I am hoping we can have that vote tonight, and we will know something in a few minutes.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 216

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we resume consideration of the Casey amendment No. 216; that there be 2 minutes equally divided before we proceed to a vote in relation to the amendment; that there be no amendments in order to the Casey amendment prior to the vote; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that the vote occur at 5:25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as we are waiting for Senator CASEY, I don't think there is any opposition to this amendment. I see the ranking member on the floor and I am wondering if she has anything she wishes to add at this point.

I said earlier Members have been very cooperative in trying to minimize—still have an open debate but nevertheless minimize—the issues and the amendments so we can pass this important bill and get it over to the House and onto the President's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair as well. I wish to speak to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I think it is a critical amendment for the contracting process. As the Chair well understands, because I know the Chair has called many meetings on contracts and processes, and over the years we have attempted to rectify and mitigate many of the problems that have arisen during the course of a contract to make sure there is access for small business within the Federal agencies, I have heard, as I know the Chair has as well, from countless small businesses who feel abused by large prime contractors. During the procurement process when preparing for government bids, oftentimes large prime contractors do not fulfill their obligations to use small businesses as outlined in the subcontracting plan. They identify the small businesses in their own plan that they submit to the government, they win the contract, and then they turn around and don't use the small businesses they have identified in their bid

they have submitted to the Federal Government. So I wish to congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania for identifying an important way to make sure small businesses are not left out of this process, because they are required—once they have been identified in an open, large prime contractor's plan, they are required to use that small business. But, unfortunately, if a small business is not notified that the large prime contractor has won that bid from the Federal agency, they have no way of pursuing a process by which they make sure they are part of that overall bid.

I think it is very important that small businesses have access to the procurement process, and when large contractors are including small businesses, we have to make sure they notify the small businesses about their intent to use them in the bid process, and to make sure they are aware that they have won the contract as well. This becomes paramount because small businesses then have the opportunity to contract with Federal agencies because the Federal Government is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the world, spending more than \$500 billion in fiscal year 2000 alone. For small firms that are struggling to stay afloat and maintain their workforce, Federal contracting can be an instrumental part of the larger strategy for broadening their customer base in creating jobs. So it is a commonsense amendment that protects small businesses from abuses during the Federal procurement process.

Also, I think the reporting mechanism that is created by the Senator's amendment will allow small businesses to report fraudulent activity with respect to subcontracting plans. These small business protections will benefit small contracting firms without adding an undue burden to the government's acquisition workforce. I think it is an amendment that is not only practical but critical in making sure small business has fair access and opportunities for procurement within the Federal agencies, and more to curb the abuses that have occurred with large prime contractors that either disguise themselves as small businesses and go through the contracting process or use small businesses in their bid but never notify the small businesses of their intent to use them and, therefore, small businesses have no opportunity to pursue the legal process, due process to make sure they can report these abuses.

I urge support of the Casey amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I already spoke earlier on the amendment—actually, twice today, so I won't reiterate those points. I wish to thank and commend the work done by Senator LANDRIEU and Senator SNOWE and the way they have worked together in a bipartisan manner to move this bill forward but in particular to help us pass

this amendment. We are looking forward to the vote, and I want to thank them for their help.

I yield the floor.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, how much time remains before the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 45 seconds remaining.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Let me use the 45 seconds to ask unanimous consent to be listed as a cosponsor of the Casey amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I wish to join Senator SNOWE in supporting this amendment. We have received actually many complaints from small businesses at any number of the roundtables we have held in our committee about the old bait and switch that is going on, where their names are used by large contractors to actually succeed in receiving the bid or winning the bid, and then, as Senator SNOWE stated, their companies are switched out and they don't even know it. This also puts an enforcement mechanism in place and actually mandates the SBA to come up with an enforcement mechanism so we can have more honesty and transparency.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 216.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 43 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Feinstein	Merkley
Alexander	Franken	Mikulski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Baucus	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Hatch	Paul
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Portman
Blunt	Hutchison	Pryor
Boozman	Inhofe	Reed
Boxer	Inouye	Reid
Brown (MA)	Isakson	Risch
Brown (OH)	Johanns	Roberts
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cardin	Kerry	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Sessions
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kohl	Shelby
Coats	Kyl	Snowe
Coburn	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Lautenberg	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Conrad	Lee	Toomey
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Corker	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Lugar	Vitter
Crapo	Manchin	Warner
DeMint	McCain	Webb
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Ensign	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The amendment (No. 216) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight the importance of agriculture and celebrate National Agriculture Week.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower once said:

Farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you're a thousand miles away from a cornfield.

This week reminds us that it is our job to bridge the gap between plowing fields and crafting laws and make sure our ranchers and farmers have the tools they need.

In my home State of Montana, agriculture is the heart and soul of our economy. It is an essential part of who we are. In Montana, agriculture is not simply a livelihood, it is our way of life. Growing up on a ranch outside of Helena taught me firsthand the values of hard work, faith, family, and doing what is right—values I try to bring with me to work every day.

Fifty percent of Montana's economy is tied to ranching and farming, and one in five Montana jobs is tied in some way to agriculture. It is our No. 1 industry. Each year, Montana ranchers and farmers produce nearly \$3 billion of the highest quality agricultural goods produced anywhere in the world.

As a nation, we are blessed with a safe, affordable, and abundant food supply. Our farmers and ranchers in our country put food on the tables of families around the world, and they help create good-paying jobs here at home. Every year, the average American farmer feeds 155 people worldwide.

While agriculture stands in the spotlight this week, it is critical to remember the words of President Eisenhower and recognize the needs of our ranchers and farmers every day throughout the year.

Next week, I will be holding a series of listening sessions across Montana to discuss the next farm bill. I did that last time around and they were terrific. I learned so much by having these listening sessions all across our State. I will be starting Monday in the eastern part of Montana—in towns such as Forsyth and Miles City—and over the next year I will work my way across the State collecting ideas and information from Montana's farmers and ranchers to make sure the next farm bill works for them.

I am lucky to represent so many ranchers and farmers in our State who have dedicated their life to the land. It is so important, and it roots us in our State. It grounds us. I am proud to

honor these folks today during National Agriculture Week.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is proceeding to consider legislation to reauthorize the Small Business Innovation Research Program and Small Business Technology Transfer Program, SBIR/STTR. Our Nation's small businesses and start-ups are crucial to maintaining America's position as the world leader in technology and innovation. The SBIR/STTR programs improve the ability of small businesses to take part in federally funded research.

Last week, the Senate voted 95-5 to pass another bill to help small businesses and our economic recovery, the America Invents Act. This legislation will provide our small businesses and start-ups the legal landscape that they need to protect and commercialize their inventions to create jobs and boost our economy.

The Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, in strongly endorsing the America Invents Act, wrote that "[p]atent reform is needed to clarify and simplify the system; to properly protect legitimate patents; and to reduce costs in the system, including when it comes to litigation and the international marketplace."

Similarly, Louis Foreman, an inventor and advocate for other independent inventors wrote that the legislation "will make independent inventors, such as myself, more competitive in today's global marketplace."

Both the council and Mr. Foreman specifically noted the importance of transitioning to "first-inventor-to-file" and ending fee diversion at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

The America Invents Act will benefit small businesses and start-ups in several specific ways. First, the legislation will make it more difficult for large infringers to harass a patent owner through successive administrative challenges of the patent or challenges that have no likelihood of success. Large corporations often use these challenges to avoid license fees or discourage an infringement suit. For small businesses, patent owners and independent inventors, the expense of countering these tactics can make enforcement of their patents difficult to impossible. The improvements that this legislation makes to the inter partes system will limit harassment.

Second, the America Invents Act requires discounts for small businesses at the Patent and Trademark Office, PTO. Specifically, the bill mandates that the PTO provide a 50-percent reduction in fees for small business, and a 75-percent reduction in fees for businesses that receive a new "micro-entity" designation as truly small and independent inventors. Together, these provisions ensure that the PTO's need to collect fees for services is not done on the backs of small businesses. Small businesses will, therefore, be able to afford patent protection better than today.

Third, as part of the transition to first-inventor-to-file, the America Invents Act eliminates costly interference proceedings as the method for determining the right to a patent between competing inventors in favor of a derivation proceeding. Under current law, before enactment of the American Invents Act, when more than one application claiming the same invention is filed, the patent is given to the applicant who has the resources to prove their claim to the invention. This costly proceeding is almost always won by larger corporations. A derivation proceeding is far simpler and does not require meticulous notes by the inventor, which gives large corporations an advantage, because the key date is the date of application.

Finally, the legislation will improve patent quality overall. Roughly half of all patents in litigation have claims invalidated. When there are too many patents out there that are not able to withstand court scrutiny, it leads to a more difficult climate for small businesses to license their inventions and raise capital from investors. By improving our patent system, we can provide confidence that when a patent is granted, it is of high quality, and inventors can rely on that.

The New York Times editorialized last week that today, "The patent system is too cumbersome, and it doesn't protect the small inventor. The America Invents Act is a smart reform." Indeed, the legislation is crucial to fulfilling the promise that we make to small businesses and independent inventors that if they put in the hard work, the United States is the place where a great invention will be rewarded. I thank the 95 Senators who voted in favor of Senate passage of the America Invents Act and look forward to continuing our work with Chairman SMITH the House of Representatives to get the legislation to the President's desk without unnecessary delay. We tried to make sure that patent reform in the America Invents Act helps small businesses and increases their ability to serve as an engine for economic growth and good jobs here in America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

DEBIT CARD SWIPE FEES

Mr. DURBIN. This week, we are considering legislation on the Senate floor that affects small businesses. I want to talk about another issue very important to small businesses; that is, the topic of interchange fees, also known as swipe fees.

Last week, nearly 200 small businesses came to Washington, DC, from Illinois and from all across America. They came to stand up in support of the reform of interchange fees, swipe fees, that Congress passed last year. They came to stand up to the major credit card companies, Visa and MasterCard, and the \$13 trillion banking industry that is doing everything in its power to reverse this reform.

We all know small businesses are the key to our economy and its future. We need for them to be able to grow, to hire more workers, and serve their customers well. But debit card swipe fees set by Visa and MasterCard on behalf of their big bank allies are crushing many small businesses.

Back in 2009, the banks made over \$16 billion per year in debit swipe fees, about \$1.3 billion per month. Now, \$16 billion may not sound like a lot of money when you compare it to the \$20.8 billion that the New York State comptroller said was paid out in Wall Street bonuses to major financial institutions just last year, but it is a huge amount when it affects small business.

For most Americans on Main Street, \$16 billion in swipe fees is quite a lot. This money comes out of the pockets of small business owners across America and out of the pockets of their customers, who pay higher prices for gas and groceries as a result.

According to data from the Federal Reserve and the Nilson Report, over half of all debit interchange fees—more than \$8 billion per year—goes to just 10 giant banks.

What it boils down to is this: Some who are pushing for a delay in this reform are literally offering a handout of \$16 billion mainly to the biggest banks in America.

The swipe fee system does not have transparency and has no competition. The bottom line is that the current debit card system in this country is a broken market. Ask any retailer, large or small, hotel owner, restaurant owner, convenience store owner, gas station, ask them what bargaining

power they have when it comes to the amount they are charged for the use of a debit card, and the answer is, none. Ask them how much is being paid in each transaction. And the answer is, it is secret. Now, is that how you would build an economy, with no competition and no transparency? That is exactly what is going on with the duopoly of Visa and MasterCard imposing these fees on small businesses.

The banks and card companies are sending an army of lobbyists to Congress to undo the reform Congress passed last year. There are hundreds of bankers swarming over Capitol Hill this week. Several Members who have never supported an interchange reform in the first place have introduced legislation to delay that reform that we passed. I am sorry to say that this plays right into the banking industry's effort to avoid accountability.

I want my colleagues to know that small businesses are going to tell their side of the story too.

Todd McCracken is the president of the National Small Business Association. He came to Capitol Hill last week, and this is what he said:

Small businesses aren't trying to do away with credit and debit cards, we just want them to play by the rules. Small businesses have been at the mercy of these large banks for years, and the swipe fee reforms merely inject fairness and transparency into a market that has been dictated by a handful of companies for years.

Hundreds of small businesses also submitted formal comments to the Federal Reserve in support of reform. Those comments are posted on the Federal Reserve's Web site. I would like to read a few of those from my home State of Illinois.

Nolan Williamson runs a flower shop. It is called Jerry's Flower Shoppe in Carbondale, IL. Carbondale, IL, in southern Illinois, is the home of Southern Illinois University. Here is what Nolan wrote to the Federal Reserve:

In 1964, Jerry's Flower Shoppe opened, and for 35 years I have been a partner in the business. We are located in a university town, and our business depends greatly on the university. Since the university budget is down and they are not spending, our business is suffering.

We have streamlined our business as much as possible. We were forced to lay off one employee for a while, then brought her back at reduced pay and reduced hours. As a retail business, we have no choice but to accept credit and debit cards. We had to increase prices to cover the high interchange card fees. Even with a price increase, these high card fees are eating away our profits.

Nolan concluded by saying:

Help our struggling business and other small businesses around the country. Reduce our swipe fees to 12 cents as proposed.

He alludes to the fact that when the Federal Reserve took a look at the actual interchange fee being charged for the use of a debit card, they estimated the average to be over 40 cents per transaction, which is more than 1.1 percent of the value of each transaction. The actual cost? Less than 10 cents. So what the credit and debit

card companies are doing is imposing a fee that there is no bargaining over, no competition, no disclosure, and forcing retailers to pay it. Jerry's Flower Shoppe does not have a fighting chance against Visa and MasterCard. They have to pay it or else. That is, of course, transferred to a cost to customers and reduced profit to the owners.

Here is another comment from Bob Stork. He owns Stork's Catering in Springfield. I know Bob. Here is what he says:

My business has been in operation for about 35 years. We are just a small enterprise with five employees. The economic situation has taken a toll not only on my business, but also on companies all across the country. Personally, I believe that swipe fees are hindering these struggling businesses even further. If these fees keep rising, they will eventually place such a strain on us that we may be forced to close our doors. Please continue your efforts to regulate the debit swipe fees.

Here is a comment from Norman Flynn. He has a business, Culligan Water Conditioning, in Macomb, had it for over 70 years in his family. He said:

We really cannot afford to keep getting hit with unnecessary fees. Please seek to get the proposed rule implemented quickly so that debit swipe fees will be lowered and small businesses will get some breathing room.

I hope my colleagues understand that these small businesses need relief right now. They need to understand that delaying swipe fee reform, which a bill just introduced this week would do, would give Visa and MasterCard and the banks a multibillion-dollar handout and would leave small businesses and consumers footing the bill.

We have heard a lot about the bailout of Wall Street. This is the handout to Wall Street. To think that they would turn around and give to these companies \$32 billion in handouts, most of it going to the largest banks in America, by delaying this rule at the expense of small businesses and consumers all across America.

As the big banks and card companies make their pitch, I hope my colleagues will make their choice to stand with Main Street instead of Wall Street. I hope they choose to stand on the side of hard-working small business owners. Most Americans understand—and I sure do—that good jobs are created by small businesses all over this country. We have to be on their side in this struggle and not on the side of the biggest banks and Wall Street.

I wish to respond to another argument that was raised recently against interchange reform. Banks such as JPMorgan Chase have started threatening that interchange reform will force them to limit debit card transactions to \$100 per transaction. This threat is so hollow, I am amazed they are saying it publicly. It is a threat that defies basic logic. Remember, it does not cost a bank any more to conduct a \$100 debit transaction than it does a \$1 transaction. In both cases, the cardholder must already have the

money in his account. The costs to transfer that money through the network's wires are the same no matter the dollar amount. The only logical reason why banks such as Chase would make this threat is to scare opposition to interchange reform.

Once reform takes effect, big banks such as Chase would be crazy to follow through on this threat of imposing dollar limits on debit transactions. If they did, consumers will start moving in droves to small banks which are not regulated by this bill and will not impose unnecessary restrictions.

Chase also has no business to argue that they have to limit large-dollar debit transactions because they are afraid about fraud. Remember, this is the same Chase bank that last April told all of its debit card holders not to use PIN numbers even though PIN has one-sixth as much fraud loss as signature debit cards. Chase did this because Visa and MasterCard give higher interchange fees for signature debit than for PIN debit. Chase is the poster child for banks that have brought increased fraud risks upon themselves by not using PIN numbers.

I also want to respond to my colleagues who tell me they are hearing from banks and card companies that consumers might be hurt by interchange reform. First of all, these banks and card companies have no credibility when it comes to speaking on behalf of consumers. They say interchange reform will force them to raise fees on consumers, but they will not even admit that they were already raising consumer fees to record levels before interchange change reform passed.

Glance back at headlines like these: November 12, 2008, Wall Street Journal, "Banks Boost Customer Fees to Record Highs." May 28, 2009, USA TODAY, "Banks Find Ways to Boost Fees; Checking Accounts Latest Target."

Banks and card companies also refuse to concede that consumers already bear the cost of interchange fees in the form of higher retail prices. That is particularly hard on the unbanked and low-income Americans.

Instead of listening to banks and card companies about consumer interests, I suggest my colleagues listen to those consumer groups in Washington.

Just this week, the Consumer Federation of America sent a letter to all Senators. Here is what it said:

The current interchange system is uncompetitive, non-transparent, and harmful to consumers. It is simply unjust to require less affluent Americans who do not participate in or benefit from the payment card or banking system to pay for excessive debit interchange fees that are passed through to the cost of goods and services. As a result, the Consumer Federation of America does not support delaying implementation of the new law.

Other groups, such as U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Public Citizen, and the Hispanic Institute, have argued strongly that interchange reform will help consumers across America, just as it has helped consumers in many other

countries that have undertaken reform.

Do you know what the interchange fee is in Canada? It is zero. The same companies that are offering debit cards here in the United States do not charge an interchange fee in Canada. And they have just recently reduced the interchange fees dramatically in Europe, much lower than the United States. Same companies.

How can they do that? They did it because the governments of Europe stepped up and said: This is a ripoff. You can no longer impose, unilaterally, interchange fees, and we are going to regulate it.

They said: Please do not. We will just drop the fees dramatically.

And they did.

Look what is happening here. We have a group of Senators and Congressmen who are now saying: We are not only refusing to assert the rights of consumers, we are going to back off and let the banks and card companies charge whatever they want for at least 2 more years. Whatever happened to our sensitivity to the people we are supposed to represent—the consumers and the small businesses? That, to me, is a troubling outcome, if, in fact, those who push this legislation continue to do so.

We all know the game plan that Visa, MasterCard, and the \$13 trillion banking industry is using.

We have seen it before. They will try to kill interchange reform outright using threats and scare tactics. If they can't kill it, they will try to delay it, praying that the next President and the next Congress will be even friendlier to the banking industry.

Exactly the same thing happened when Congress passed the Credit Card Act in 2009. The banks and card companies fell all over themselves trying to raise fees before the rules went into effect. When I would go home to Springfield, my wife would say to me: Guess what, here is another notice from the credit card company raising the interest rate you have to pay on late charges. I thought you passed credit card reform.

I said: It doesn't take effect for a few more months. They are running as fast as they can to run up the fees in the meantime.

That is what is happening to businesses with the interchange fees. A lot of people don't know it because they don't get a notice in the mail about the interchange fee. That has been their game plan in the past, and it is their game plan again.

I am sick of the big banks and card companies squeezing American consumers and small businesses with tricks and traps and unfair fees. I will stand with the small businesses and consumers of America on this issue. I will fight the big banks and the big credit cards and their efforts to kill or delay swipe fee reform.

I urge my colleagues to join me in standing up for Main Street and

against the abusive fees and practices of Wall Street.

JAPAN TRAGEDY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my deepest condolences to the people of Japan, and to reaffirm that the United States stands ready to assist the country and its people in this time of tremendous need.

On Friday, March 11, the world watched in horror as a devastating 9.0-magnitude earthquake struck off the northeastern coast of Japan, triggering a devastating tsunami that sent a 30-foot high wall of water hurtling into coastal towns and leaving complete destruction in its wake.

As a Senator from California, which has far too often experienced the devastation of earthquakes, I was horrified by the magnitude of this event.

In a stunning development, scientists are now saying that the quake caused the island of Japan to shift by 8 feet and the Earth's axis to move by 4 inches.

In Japanese cities such as Sendai and Minami Sanriku, entire communities and countless lives vanished in an instant. In Minami Sanriku alone, 10,000 members of a population of 17,000 remain unaccounted for.

The force of the tsunami generated by the quake was so great that waves traveled across the Pacific Ocean at more than 500 miles per hour, slamming into Hawaii and cities along the California and Oregon coasts.

Today, we know that an estimated 4,277 lives have been confirmed lost—a figure that will undoubtedly rise—and that hundreds of thousands have been displaced. In this time of extraordinary grief, our thoughts and prayers go out to those who have lost loved ones and to those whose family and friends remain missing.

What we also know is that without Japan's strict building codes and well-developed early warning systems, this terrible tragedy would have been much worse.

I praise the work of all the first responders who are working around the clock in Japan. Tens of thousands of Japanese rescue workers have been joined by teams from around the world, including from the United States and China.

I know that this includes a search and rescue team from Los Angeles County.

The team, which left for Japan on Saturday, is made up of 74 rescue personnel including firefighters and paramedics as well as six teams of search dogs who are trained to look for survivors trapped in debris left by the earthquake and tsunami.

There are also approximately 600 servicemembers from Naval Air Station Lemoore in California aboard the U.S.S. Ronald Reagan aircraft carrier, who are assisting relief efforts off the Japanese coast.

Our deepest gratitude goes out to all of those who are working tirelessly to

save lives and bring comfort to communities in need.

We also know that the earthquake and tsunami have caused tremendous difficulty at a number of nuclear energy facilities within Japan.

The damage and subsequent failure of systems at these nuclear reactors are a clear warning that we must step up efforts to ensure that every precaution is taken to safeguard all of our people from a similar nuclear disaster.

Special and immediate attention should be given to those nuclear reactors that share similar conditions as the failing reactors in Japan—those located near a coastline or fault line, or those with a similar design.

We must all reexamine our assumptions about what constitutes a credible threat to those reactors and ensure we learn the lessons shown to us by the recent events in Japan.

As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, which has jurisdiction over domestic nuclear regulatory activities, I will ensure that our members have full briefings on all of these issues, and I will hold a hearing on the safety of the Nation's nuclear facilities and what lessons can be learned from the dangerous situation at the failing reactors in Japan. I am also calling on the NRC to conduct a comprehensive investigation of these issues, with a focus on areas that are especially vulnerable to seismic activity like California.

I would also like to spend a few moments talking about the approximately 300,000 Japanese-Americans who call California home.

I am particularly proud that the Japanese American community in my State has quickly stepped up to assist with relief efforts in the aftermath of this horrible tragedy. This includes the Japan America Society of Southern California—a nonprofit organization founded in 1909 to build relationships between the United States and Japan. This also includes the nonprofit Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Northern California. These are just a couple of examples of how Californians are pulling together to help the thousands who have been devastated by the earthquake and tsunami.

I thank all those in California, and those across the country and the world, who have responded to this tragedy with an outpouring of support for the people of Japan.

I would also like to take just a brief moment to thank the Federal, State, and local officials in Hawaii, California and along the west coast for their quick response in warning residents of the tsunami threat and assisting those communities affected by severe waves.

Coastal areas in northern California, particularly Crescent City and Santa Cruz, were impacted by these waves, resulting in damages to port and harbor infrastructure. I am pleased that federal officials arrived in California Monday and are working with State and local officials to assess the situation.

And finally, I thank Senators REID, MCCONNELL, KERRY, and LUGAR for drafting a resolution on the tragedy which passed the Senate Monday evening. I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The resolution expresses the Senate's deepest condolences to all of those affected by this tragedy, including the families of the victims. It also urges the U.S. Government and the international community to provide any additional assistance the Japanese government may need as it moves toward healing, rebuilding, and recovery.

Experts tell us that events of this magnitude are rare—in fact, this was the largest recorded earthquake in Japan's history.

While we hope and pray that we never see such a horrific event again, this tragedy serves as a stark reminder of nature's extraordinary power and how precious and fragile life is.

Let us also use this as an opportunity to redouble our commitment here in America to do the hard work of preparing for the unthinkable.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CORPORAL LOREN M. BUFFALO

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life of one of America's bravest killed in action in Afghanistan—CPL Loren M. Buffalo—a fallen hero who served our Nation in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Corporal Buffalo, 20, of Mountain Pine, AR, was by all accounts, driven by a call to serve his country and strong sense of civic duty.

The son of an Arkansas National Guardsman and the grandson of a World War II veteran, Corporal Buffalo joined the Army in 2009, just after graduating from Mountain Pine High School. His father, Cecil Buffalo, told *The Sentinel-Record*, that he knew his son wanted to serve his country all the way back in junior high. Mr. Buffalo said his son was a “strong-hearted all-American boy” who “loved his country and wanted to serve it.”

In Mountain Pine, Corporal Buffalo is remembered as a young man who would make the best out of any situation. One of his mentors said that Corporal Buffalo “was 100 percent about community.” During his teenage years, Corporal Buffalo undertook a number of projects honoring and supporting our Nation's veterans.

Beyond a life of service, Corporal Buffalo enjoyed making music. A multitalented musician, Mr. Buffalo said his son could play the guitar, drums, bass and “just about anything you put in his hand.”

Corporal Buffalo was assigned to B Troop, 1st Squadron, 75th Cavalry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division based out of Fort Campbell, KY. According to initial reports, he died from injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near his dismounted patrol in Kandahar. He received multiple medals for service, including a Purple Heart and a Bronze Star.

Corporal Buffalo made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedoms. I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in honoring his life and legacy. I ask that we all keep his family, fellow soldiers and friends in our thoughts and prayers during this difficult time. He is a true American hero.

RECOGNIZING POLAND SPRINGS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in these challenging economic times, it is a pleasure to recognize a business that is growing and creating new jobs as it demonstrates environmental stewardship and community citizenship. The Poland Spring Water Company of Maine is such a business.

The pure, natural spring water found in Maine's Western Mountains has been prized by residents and travelers since the earliest days of our Nation. In 1845, Hiram Ricker began bottling this water and a company was born. By 1904, the water had gained international praise earning medals of excellence at the Columbian Exposition and the World's Fair. The Ricker Inn, which opened a decade later, hosted such illustrious guests as Presidents Cleveland and Taft.

Today, Poland Spring is one of the best-selling bottled spring water brands in North America. Its bottling plants in three Maine communities provide some 800 good-paying, skilled jobs. Its annual payroll of \$40 million and \$65 million in purchases of goods and services from other Maine companies make it a mainstay of our State's rural economy. Its generous support for schools, fire and rescue, conservation, and many other causes strengthen our communities.

Three years ago, Poland Spring opened its newest plant in the small town of Kingfield with 40 workers. This year, employment stands at 70 and the Kingfield operation was recently named "The Best Plant in North America" by Poland Springs' parent company, Nestle Waters. That is an outstanding record of growth and accomplishment in such a short time, but it doesn't surprise me to see a Maine facility achieve this distinction.

Poland Spring does not just bottle water—it is a diligent guardian of Maine's precious groundwater resources. The company's extensive monitoring efforts to protect water quality and the local watershed set a standard for the industry worldwide. From its ultra-light plastic bottle and energy-efficient building design to its operation of the largest biodiesel trucking fleet in Maine, Poland Spring's commitment to the environment is seen at every step of the process.

I congratulate the Poland Spring Water Company for more than 160 years of contributions to the State of Maine and the Kingfield facility for its recognition as the best in North America.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO KATIE HURLEY

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, today I recognize a great Alaskan as she celebrates her 90th birthday at the end of this month. Katie Hurley was born and raised in Juneau, AK, and embodies so much of what makes Alaska great. She is a living history of the State of Alaska.

Katie was there at the very beginning of the push for Alaska Statehood, serving Governor Ernest Gruening in Alaska's territorial days. Katie served as chief clerk to the Alaska Constitutional Convention in Fairbanks during the very cold winter of 1955–1956. With a manual typewriter and mimeograph machine, she had minutes and amendments ready every morning for the delegates. It is Katie's voice you can hear in the audio recordings of the final roll call vote of the Constitutional Convention.

Katie's public service to Alaska transcends every level of government. Governor Bill Egan appointed Katie to the State Board of Education where she served for 7 years. She served to the term limit under Governor Egan but was reappointed by Governor Jay Hammond. She has been elected to the Alaska State Legislature and the Matanuska Telephone and Matanuska Electric association boards. She embodies completely what it means to be a public servant and community member.

It is appropriate Katie's birthday falls during Women's History Month. Katie is a role model for so many Alaskan women. She was the first woman in Alaska to win her party's nomination for statewide office. Katie was the first executive director of the Alaska Commission on the Status of Women and was appointed by Governor Steve Cowper to the Human Rights Commission in 1987, serving twice as chair.

She is still active in the Alaska chapter of the National Organization of Women. In the past, she would grab her knitting—baby blankets for her grandchildren—to attend legislative hearings on women's reproductive health rights. She has been a tenacious advocate for title IX funding and education equity. Katie is a breast cancer survivor of 21 years and still participates in the annual Alaska Run for Women to raise money for breast cancer research. Last year—at age 89—she finished the 5-mile course with her team.

Anyone who knows Katie understands she is never one to slow down. Her enthusiasm is infectious, and she still spends time imparting Alaska's history to young Alaskans and reminding all Alaskans of the common goals we shared at statehood and the spirit in which our State constitution was drafted.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Katie and her decades of service to Alaska on her 90th birthday. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Jonathan Andrew Hatfield, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Corporation for National and Community Service.

*Kelvin K. Droegemeier, of Oklahoma, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation for a term expiring May 10, 2016.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Heather A. Higginbottom, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

*Carolyn N. Lerner, of Maryland, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, for the term of five years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 592. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to remove the cap on punitive damages established by the Supreme Court in *Exxon Shipping Company v. Baker*; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. BURR, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. INOUE, Mrs. HAGAN, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax rate for excise tax on investment income of private foundations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 594. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to facilitate the ability of persons affected by oil spills to seek judicial redress; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 595. A bill to amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to complete payments under such title to local educational agencies eligible for such payments within 3 fiscal years; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 596. A bill to establish a grant program to benefit victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 597. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include neurologists as primary care physicians for purposes of incentive payments for primary care services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 598. A bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 599. A bill to establish a commission to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the American Civil War; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 600. A bill to promote the diligent development of Federal oil and gas leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 601. A bill to encourage and ensure the use of safe football helmets and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 602. A bill to require regulatory reform; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 603. A bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. Res. 103. A resolution providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 206

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) were added as cosponsors of S. 206, a bill to reauthorize the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program, and for other purposes.

S. 328

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 328, a bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that countervailing duties may be imposed to address subsidies relating to fundamentally undervalued currency of any foreign country.

S. 358

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 358, a bill to codify and modify regulatory requirements of Federal agencies.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 382, a bill to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding additional recreational uses of National Forest System land that is subject to ski area permits, and for other permits.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 398, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve energy efficiency of certain appliances and equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Main-

tenance Trust Fund are used for harbor maintenance.

S. 418

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 418, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 453

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 453, a bill to improve the safety of motorcoaches, and for other purposes.

S. 461

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 461, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend financing of the Superfund.

S. 468

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 468, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the authority of the Administrator to disapprove specifications of disposal sites for the discharge of, dredged or fill material, and to clarify the procedure under which a higher review of specifications may be requested.

S. 520

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 520, a bill to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) were added as cosponsors of S. 534, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain small producers.

S. 541

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to increase implementation of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports and early intervening services in order to improve student academic achievement, reduce disciplinary problems in schools, and to improve coordination with similar activities and services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 554, a bill to prohibit the use of Department of Justice funds for the prosecution in Article III courts of the United States of individuals involved in the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 570, a bill to prohibit the Department of Justice from tracking and cataloguing the purchases of multiple rifles and shotguns.

S. 575

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 575, a bill to study the market and appropriate regulatory structure for electronic debit card transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 585

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 585, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants for the support of full-service community schools, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 99

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 99, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the primary safeguard for the well-being and protection of children is the family, and that the primary safeguards for the legal rights of children in the United States are the Constitutions of the United States and the several States, and that, because the use of international treaties to govern policy in the United States on families and children is contrary to principles of self-government and federalism, and that, because the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child undermines traditional principles of law in the United States regarding parents and children, the President should not transmit the Convention to the Senate for its advice and consent.

S. RES. 102

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 102, a resolution calling for a no-fly zone and the recognition of the Transitional National Council in Libya.

AMENDMENT NO. 161

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 161 proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the

SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 182

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 182 proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 183

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 183 proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 183 proposed to S. 493, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 186

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 186 proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 194

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 194 intended to be proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 195

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 195 intended to be proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 196

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 196 intended to be proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 197

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No.

197 proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 210

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 210 intended to be proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 215

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 215 intended to be proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 215 intended to be proposed to S. 493, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 216

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 216 proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 216 proposed to S. 493, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 219

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 219 intended to be proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 223

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 223 intended to be proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 596. A bill to establish a grant program to benefit victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join today with my partner, Senator CORNYN, to reintroduce the Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking Deterrence and Victims Support Act. This bi-partisan legislation, which was approved unanimously by the Senate in

the 111th Congress, just a few months ago, as S.2925, is the first comprehensive approach to combating the terrible and fast-growing criminal enterprise of trafficking of children for sex right here in the U.S.

Many people don't have any idea how many children in the U.S. are forced into sexual slavery. It is truly a moral abomination that an estimated 100,000 minors are trafficked for sex in the U.S. each year. The reason that this crime has reached epidemic proportions is simple: the resources are not in place to help innocent victims escape from trafficking, nor to punish the violent, ruthless pimps who are trafficking them.

In talking to law enforcement officials in Oregon, I learned that gang members, pimps, and traffickers have figured out that trafficking a person is a lot less risky, and just as profitable, as trafficking drugs. A pimp can make \$200,000 a year on one trafficking victim. And they know they can exploit vulnerable minors and not get caught because law enforcement lacks the training and resources to stop this crime. The Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking Deterrence and Victims Support Act aims to turn that around.

This bill would, for the first time, provide a comprehensive solution for addressing this problem. The bill would establish a pilot project of six block grants in locations in different regions of the country with significant sex trafficking activity. The block grants would be awarded by the Department of Justice to state or local government applicants that have developed a workable, comprehensive plan to combat sex trafficking. The grants would require a multi-disciplinary approach to addressing trafficking problems. Applicants for the grants would have to demonstrate they can work together with local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers to achieve the goals of the bill.

Government agencies that get the grants would be required to create shelters where trafficking victims would be safe from their pimps, and where they could start getting treatment for the trauma they have suffered. The shelters would provide counseling, legal services, and mental and physical health services, including treatment for substance abuse, sexual abuse, and trauma-informed care. The shelters would also provide food, clothing, and other necessities, as well as education and training to help victims get their lives on track.

The bill would also provide training for law enforcement officers. I worked with some of the pioneering officers out there like Doug Justus in Portland and Byron Fassett in Dallas who really understand this issue. But, unfortunately, what Doug and Byron have told me is that most officers don't have the training to recognize a sex trafficking victim and don't know how to handle those victims in a way that will allow

them to feel like they can turn away from their pimp. Without this training—and without shelters—there's no way to begin building criminal cases against the pimps, and no way to get these victims to come to court to testify in criminal trials.

That is why it is going to take a comprehensive plan to finally turn the tables on pimps. Without trained officers and service providers, and available shelters, there is no support and safe place for children who are being trafficked. Right now there are only between 50 and 70 shelter beds in the entire country for minor victims of sex trafficking. That is unacceptable. This bill will change that, and begin to provide hope for trafficking victims.

Another serious aspect of this problem that this bill would address is the issue of repeat runaways. Evidence shows that the children at greatest risk of becoming involved in sex trafficking are kids who have run away from home over and over again. Many of them are children who have been in the foster care system. The problem is that there is often no report made when a child runs away, and thus no way to know when a child is a repeat runaway and at greatest risk.

This bill would strengthen reporting requirements for runaway or missing children, and encourage the FBI to enhance the National Crime Information Center, NCIC, database, which is where missing child reports are filed. Doing so would give law enforcement officers better information on the children at greatest risk by flagging repeat runaways.

Before I conclude, I want to express that this is a very personal issue with very personal consequences. I had a chance to feel this personal heartbreak last year when I accompanied police officers along 82nd Avenue in my hometown of Portland. I will never forget a 15-year-old girl working out there with the tools of the trade. She had a cell phone to stay in constant contact with her pimp and report how much money she had made. She had a 15-inch butcher knife because she knew she needed to protect herself. She had a purse full of condoms, because she knew she couldn't stop until she'd had more customers during the course of the evening.

The fact that there are thousands of young girls like her out on the streets, all across the country, every single day, is nothing short of a national emergency. This bill sends a clear and powerful message to the victims of this abuse, that somebody cares about her health and wellbeing. That is why I hope Congress will act quickly to provide help for young girls like the one I met by passing this bill.

Last year, this legislation passed the Senate by unanimous consent and the House by voice vote. Unfortunately, the bill passed the House shortly before Congress adjourned, and there was no time to resolve the minor differences between the two chambers' bills. But I

will do everything I can to see that this bill moves forward promptly so that sex trafficking victims can begin to receive the care they need and deserve.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the efforts of the non-profit and faith-based organizations in working on this issue. There are a lot of deeply committed groups and individuals working to help victims of sex trafficking. Their good work has laid the foundation for our efforts here in the Congress.

I want to acknowledge the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the FBI's Innocence Lost Project, Polaris Project, Shared Hope International, ECPAT-USA, Rebecca Project for Human Rights, Soroptimists, and the YWCA; and there are many other fine groups that deserve thanks.

I also want to recognize the work of champions—like Ambassador Luis CdeBaca, filmmaker Libby Spears, and local officials like Multnomah County Commissioner Diane McKeel, who have raised awareness and made it their priority to fight this horrific crime. The effort to save children from sex trafficking would not be possible without the involvement of all of these groups and individuals.

Again, I want to thank Senator CORNYN for his dedication and cooperation in combating sex trafficking. I am also indebted also to the members of the Judiciary Committee who played a constructive role in shaping the bill; and I particularly thank Chairman LEAHY, Senator SESSIONS, Senator DURBIN, Senator FRANKEN, and Senator COBURN for their input and work to move this legislation forward in the last Congress. Finally, I want to acknowledge our House partners, Representatives CAROLYN MALONEY and CHRIS SMITH, who introduced companion legislation last Congress. I look forward to working with them again to quickly move this legislation forward to passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 598. A bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to introduce today a bill to strike the law commonly known as DOMA, the Defense of Marriage Act.

I want to thank my cosponsors—Senators LEAHY, GILLIBRAND, KERRY, BOXER, COONS, WYDEN, LAUTENBERG, BLUMENTHAL, MERKLEY, DURBIN, FRANKEN, SCHUMER, MURRAY, WHITEHOUSE, SHAHEEN, UDALL of Colorado, INOUE, and AKAKA for working with me on this important bill.

Today, there are between tens of thousands of legally married same-sex couples in the United States, and more than 18,000 in my State of California alone.

These couples live their lives like all married people. They share financial expenses, they raise children together, and they care for each other in good times and bad, in sickness and in health, until death do they part.

But here is the rub. Right now, because of DOMA, these couples cannot take advantage of federal protections available to every other married couple in this country.

For example, because of DOMA, these couples cannot file joint Federal income taxes and claim certain deductions; receive spousal benefits under Social Security; take unpaid leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act when a loved one falls seriously ill; obtain the protections of the estate tax when one spouse passes and wants to leave his or her possessions to another.

This has a very real impact. Let me tell you, for example, the stories of a married couple in California.

Jeanne Rizzo and Pali Cooper of Tiburon, CA, have been in a committed relationship for more than two decades. In 2008, they were married in California before their family and friends.

They have lived in the same house, shared expenses, and raised their son, Christopher, together. The Defense of Marriage Act, however, means that they cannot enjoy the simple conveniences of filing joint tax returns as a married couple or obtaining continuing health coverage under COBRA.

They have also told me the story of re-entering the United States at the end of their honeymoon in 2008. They approached a customs agent together but were told that they could not go through the line as a family. When they said that they were legally married, a customs agent reportedly responded with a curt phrase to the effect of: "Not to the United States you're not."

Put simply, under DOMA, the Federal government does not treat people equally or fairly.

Last year, a Federal District Court declared the law unconstitutional; the Obama Administration has concluded that the law violates fundamental constitutional guarantees of equal protection; and even former President Clinton, who signed the law in 1996, now supports its repeal.

The Respect for Marriage Act would right DOMA's wrong.

It would strike DOMA in its entirety. It would ensure that the Federal protections afforded to a married couple remain stable and predictable no matter where a couple lives, works, or travels.

In my lifetime, I have seen the happiness, stability, and comfort that marriage brings. When two people love each other and decide to enter this solemn commitment, I believe that is a very positive thing.

I urge my colleagues to support the Respect for Marriage Act to repeal DOMA and call on our Federal Government to honor the legal, valid marriages of all Americans.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I join the senior Senator from California and others to introduce the Respect for Marriage Act of 2011. This legislation would repeal the Defense of Marriage Act, DOMA, so that same-sex marriages authorized under State law will be recognized by the Federal Government and protected under Federal law. Since the passage of DOMA, several States, including the State of Vermont, have provided the protections of marriage to same-sex couples. Unfortunately, under current Federal law, these families are not treated fairly. That is why today's action is needed.

As Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I often find myself confronted by those who think the issue of civil rights is merely one for the history books. This is not true. There is still work to be done. The march toward equality must continue until all individuals and all families are both protected and respected. Today, Congress will begin to help bring fairness to all our Nation's families.

The issue of marriage is one that has long been left for the states to determine, and they have. Today, five States, including my home State of Vermont, plus the District of Columbia, have granted same-sex couples the right to get married. With DOMA as law, however, we are creating a tier of second-class families in States that have authorized same-sex marriage. As a Vermonter who has been married for 48 years, I believe it is important that we encourage and sanction committed relationships. That is the best way to provide for stable, supportive families. Vermont has led the Nation in this regard. In 2000, Vermont took a crucial step when it became the first State in the Nation to allow civil unions for same-sex couples. In 2009, Vermont took another important step to help sustain the relationships that fulfill our lives by becoming the first state to adopt same-sex marriage through the legislative process. I am proud of the progressive example set by my constituents, and I do not want any of them harmed by the continuing effect of DOMA.

The time has now come for the Federal Government to recognize that these families deserve all of the legal protections afforded to opposite-sex married couples recognized under state law. The Government Accountability Office issued a report in 2004 that stated that same-sex couples are denied more than one thousand Federal benefits. Right now, couples in states that authorize same-sex marriage laws cannot file joint Federal tax returns and are not entitled to the same Social Security and medical leave benefits as opposite-sex married couples under Federal law. This goes against American values and it must end.

This is a question of basic civil rights, and how the constitutional principles of the Equal Protection and Due Process Clause protect all of us from discrimination. The President and the Attorney General recognized this when they announced that the Department of Justice will no longer defend two court cases that have challenged the constitutionality of the DOMA. I applaud President Obama and Attorney General Holder for making the right decision. However, the administration is still enforcing DOMA elsewhere, because it is the law of the land. It is now time for leaders in Congress to change that law. The Respect for Marriage Act of 2011 would allow same-sex couples who are married under state law to be eligible for Federal benefits. Nothing in this bill would obligate any person, religious organization, state, or locality to celebrate or perform a marriage between two persons of the same sex. Those prerogatives would remain. What would change, however, and what must change, is the Federal Government's treatment of State-sanctioned marriage.

I believe this legislation is overdue, and it is a step in the right direction toward fostering equal treatment under law. I urge my fellow Senators to come together to support this important bill.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico
(for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG,
and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 601. A bill to encourage and ensure the use of safe football helmets and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, football fans today are wondering if there will be a National Football League season this fall. Many fans could find that their Sundays are not the same if team owners and players do not reach an agreement. Business owners who depend on those fans will also be affected. That is an issue that members of Congress have weighed in on already.

But today I want to discuss a more important issue for the future of football. Football is facing a concussion crisis—a brain injury crisis—that affects up to 4.5 million football players who are still too young to play in the NFL but may aspire to make it to the pros some day.

This fall, those kids and young adults will put on their uniforms and pads and take to the gridiron. It is a time-honored tradition that will continue regardless of what happens to the upcoming NFL season. For many rural communities in states like New Mexico, high school football means Friday night lights excitement and civic pride in the school team. This year, about 8,000 New Mexican high school players will continue this American tradition.

But football is a contact sport, and thousands of student athletes are injured every year. Many of those injuries are concussions. In fact, one study

estimates that as many as one in five football players suffers head injuries in any given football season. For young people between 15 and 24 years old, playing sports is the second-leading cause of traumatic brain injury, behind only motor vehicle crashes. Every year, there are up to 3.8 million sports-related concussions, many of which go undiagnosed and unreported.

Those alarming statistics highlight the need for more awareness about sports concussion. That is why it is appropriate to discuss this important public health and children's safety issue today, which is "Brain Injury Awareness Day."

Retired NFL great Nick Lowery—the all time leading scorer for the Kansas City Chiefs and one of the greatest kickers to play the game—explained to me:

When I played football in high school, in college, and in the National Football League, suffering a concussion was often shrugged off as merely having your 'bell rung.' My teammates had no shortage of toughness and wanted to build the mentality to 'out tough' our opponents. . . . We now know that multiple concussions can lead to lasting brain damage and should be treated as a serious matter. Today's NFL players want to set a good example for the next generation.

There have been alarming news stories about what has happened to several retired NFL players who were famous for that toughness Lowery described. Long after their careers ended, some of those NFL greats succumbed to chronic traumatic encephalopathy, CTE, caused by repeated head trauma. Last month, retired NFL player Dave Duerson took his own life with a gunshot to the chest. According to news reports, he left instructions to his family that his brain be given to the NFL Brain Bank, presumably to be examined for evidence of CTE.

Yet, what is even more alarming is that researchers have already found CTE in the brain of a deceased 18-year-old high school football player with a history of concussions. Researchers do not yet know how early an athlete might develop CTE.

TBI can also be an "invisible" injury. Without the kind of brain injury awareness that families and health care providers are trying to raise today, an athlete who suffers a mild TBI may not link that injury to common symptoms later such as headaches, nausea, and cognitive changes.

One of my constituents, Alexis Ball, is a bright college student and star soccer player at the University of New Mexico. She told my office how she struggled for months with post-concussive symptoms. Concussions forced her to sit out from play and miss classes. Thankfully, she's recovered today and now volunteers to raise concussion awareness among young athletes in Albuquerque.

But there are other cases that are much more unfortunate. The parents of one high school student athlete from Oregon named Max Conradt wrote me to explain how Max, their 17-year-old

son, returned to play quarterback too soon after suffering a concussion. Max was wearing a 20-year-old helmet when he suffered another concussion that led to brain damage. Max's parents wrote me to ask, "How is it possible that our son was issued a helmet three years older than he was?"

Unfortunately, there are an estimated 100,000 helmets out there that are more than a decade old. These helmets will be worn by high school and younger football players this fall. Many coaches will not know that some of their helmets might be older than their players. And one helmet safety expert has stated that even the best new football helmets would need to be four times better—in terms of attenuating direct, linear forces—to protect against concussion.

These facts drive my serious concerns about the current voluntary safety standards for new and reconditioned football helmets, which have not been significantly revised in three decades.

On this Brain Injury Awareness Day 2011, I am pleased to introduce bipartisan legislation, the Children's Sports Athletic Equipment Safety Act, to require improvements to the voluntary football helmet standards, including clearly visible warning and date of manufacture labels, concussion resistance, if feasible, reconditioned helmets and youth helmets.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by colleagues Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG and Senator BLUMENTHAL. We are joined by Representatives BILL PASCRELL and TODD PLATTS, who lead the Congressional TBI Task Force, and Representative ANTHONY WEINER—all of whom are original sponsors of the companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The Children's Sports Equipment Safety Act takes a "light touch" approach to improving safety. This legislation gives industry groups time to put safety first and improve their voluntary helmet standards before any mandatory federal safety rules replace them. But if those improvements are not made, then the Consumer Product Safety Commission must issue product safety rules for football helmets to protect kids.

I want to emphasize that the Children's Sports Athletic Equipment Safety Act isn't just about football helmets. This legislation would also increase the potential penalties for making false injury prevention claims for other types of sports and athletic gear.

Tackling false advertising with more severe penalties may be an increasingly important tool if companies continue to sell new headbands, helmets, and mouth guards with potentially deceptive and misleading safety claims. Young athletes could put themselves at great risk if they think a new "anti-concussion" football helmet, soccer headband, or mouth guard makes them invulnerable to brain injury. The costs of such injuries in financial terms alone are staggering. The direct med-

ical costs and indirect costs of traumatic brain injuries totaled an estimated \$60 billion in the United States in the year 2000. That figure of course does not account for the pain and suffering of victims and their families.

I am pleased that the Children's Sports Athletic Equipment Safety Act enjoys support from a broad range of organizations and individuals. DeMaurice Smith, the Executive Director of the NFL Players Association, NFLPA, states in a letter that:

Not only is the NFLPA committed to the safety of professional football players, but to all who play the sport. We recognize a significant portion of those players are youth and high school athletes who are currently at risk for traumatic brain injury due to the absence of helmet safety standards. We support the Children's Sports Athletic Equipment Safety Act as introduced and commend you for addressing this issue.

Other supporters include: Brain Injury Association of America; Brain Trauma Foundation; Cleveland Clinic; Consumer Federation of America; Consumers Union; National Consumers League; National Research Center for Women & Families; and Safe Kids USA.

Nick Lowery, who played 18 years as a professional football player and is a member of the Kansas City Chiefs Hall of Fame, notes that:

Improving sports safety for kids and discouraging sports equipment companies from making false injury prevention claims are two straightforward ways to reduce brain injuries. You can count on my enthusiastic support for this important children's safety and consumer protection legislation.

Sports and exercise should be encouraged for everyone—especially children. We must do more to ensure that kids participate in sports and exercise for all the health benefits they bring. While there will always be some risk of injury, we must make sure that athletes, coaches and parents know about the dangers and signs of concussion. We must make sure that they are using safe equipment. And we must take false advertising of safety gear out of the game.

I ask all my colleagues for their support of the Children's Sports Athletic Equipment Safety Act as part of this vital effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 601

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Children's Sports Athletic Equipment Safety Act".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings.
- Sec. 3. Football helmet safety standards.
- Sec. 4. Application of third party testing and certification requirements to youth football helmets.

Sec. 5. False or misleading claims with respect to athletic sporting activity goods.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Participation in sports and athletic activities provides many benefits to children and should be encouraged.

(2) Participation in sports and athletic activities does involve some inevitable risk of injury that no protective gear or safety device can fully eliminate.

(3) Sports-related concussion is a form of traumatic brain injury that can lead to lasting negative health consequences.

(4) Direct medical costs and indirect costs of traumatic brain injuries totaled an estimated \$60,000,000,000 in the United States in the year 2000.

(5) Sports are the second leading cause of traumatic brain injury for Americans who are 15 to 24 years old, behind only motor vehicle crashes.

(6) Every year, American athletes suffer up to an estimated 3,800,000 sports-related concussions.

(7) The potential for catastrophic injury resulting from multiple concussions make sports-related concussion a significant concern for young athletes, coaches, and parents.

(8) Football has the highest incidence of concussions, which also occur in many other sports such as baseball, basketball, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, and softball.

(9) An estimated 4,500,000 children play football in organized youth and school sports leagues, including approximately 1,500,000 high school players.

(10) According to the Consumer Product Safety Commission, more than 920,000 athletes under the age of 18 were treated in emergency rooms, doctors' offices, and clinics for football-related injuries in the year 2007.

(11) In any given football season, 20 percent of all high school football players sustain brain injuries.

(12) One study that included a post-season survey of football players found that 47 percent experienced at least one concussion and almost 35 percent experienced multiple concussions.

(13) Medical experts at Boston University School of Medicine found that a deceased 18 year old athlete, who had experienced multiple concussions playing high school football, suffered from chronic traumatic encephalopathy, a degenerative brain disease caused by head trauma.

(14) A football helmet's ability to protect players from injury by attenuating acceleration forces can decline over time as the helmet experiences thousands of hits from use during successive football seasons after its original date of manufacture.

(15) According to industry estimates, 100,000 football helmets more than ten years old, and thousands almost twenty years old, were worn by players in the 2009 season.

(16) A high school football player who suffered brain damage from being hit in the head soon after suffering a previous concussion was wearing a twenty year old football helmet when he was injured.

(17) Children as young as 5 years old rely on football helmets to protect against head injury.

(18) The widespread adoption of a voluntary industry standard for football helmet safety led to an 80 percent reduction in life-threatening subdural hematoma injuries.

(19) The voluntary industry safety standard for football helmets does not specifically address concussion risk.

(20) There is no voluntary industry safety standard specifically for youth football hel-

metts worn by children, who have different physiological characteristics from adults in terms of head size and neck strength, especially those who are younger than 12-years old.

(21) Some football helmet manufacturers and resellers have used misleading concussion safety claims to sell children's football helmets.

(22) Some used helmet reconditioners have falsely certified that reconditioned helmets provided to schools and youth football teams met voluntary industry safety standards.

(23) Used helmet reconditioners do not independently test reconditioned helmets before certifying that they meet voluntary industry safety standards.

(24) The industry organization that sets voluntary football helmet safety standards does not conduct independent testing nor market surveillance to ensure compliance with such voluntary safety standards by manufacturers and reconditioners that certify new and used helmets to such standards.

(25) Football helmet manufacturers and reconditioners place product warning labels underneath padding where the warning labels are obscured from view and not clearly legible.

(26) The Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2051 et seq.) charges the Consumer Product Safety Commission with protecting the public from unreasonable risks of serious injury or death from consumer products, including consumer products used in recreation and in schools.

(27) The Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) empowers the Federal Trade Commission to prevent unfair or deceptive acts or practices, and prohibits the dissemination of misleading claims for devices or services.

SEC. 3. FOOTBALL HELMET SAFETY STANDARDS.

(a) **VOLUNTARY STANDARD DETERMINATION.**—Within 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Consumer Product Safety Commission shall determine, with respect to a standard or standards submitted by a voluntary standards-setting organization regarding youth football helmets, reconditioned football helmets, and new football helmet concussion resistance (if feasible) whether—

(1) compliance with the standard or standards is likely to result in the elimination or adequate reduction of the risk of injury in connection with the use of football helmets;

(2) it is likely that there will be substantial compliance with the standard or standards; and

(3) the standard or standards are maintained by a standards-setting organization that meets the requirements of the document 'ANSI Essential Requirements: Due Process Requirements for American National Standards' published in January 2010 by the American National Standards Institute (or any successor document).

(b) **CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY STANDARD.**—Unless the Consumer Product Safety Commission makes an affirmative determination with respect to a standard or standards under subsection (a) that addresses the matters to which the following standards would apply, the Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding for the development of a consumer product safety rule with respect to the following:

(1) **YOUTH FOOTBALL HELMETS.**—A standard for youth football helmets which is informed by children's different physiological characteristics from adults in terms of head size and neck strength.

(2) **RECONDITIONED FOOTBALL HELMETS.**—A standard for all reconditioned football helmets.

(3) **NEW FOOTBALL HELMET CONCUSSION RESISTANCE.**—A standard for all new football

helmets that addresses concussion risk, if the Commission determines that such a standard is feasible given current understanding of concussion risk and how helmets can prevent concussion.

(4) **FOOTBALL HELMET WARNING LABELS.**—A standard for warning labels on all football helmets that, at a minimum, requires clearly legible and fully visible statements warning consumers of the limits of protection afforded by the helmet. This standard may include requirements for pictograms, instructions, guidelines, or other cautions to consumers about injury risk and the proper use of football helmets.

(5) **DATE OF MANUFACTURE LABEL FOR NEW FOOTBALL HELMETS.**—A standard for a clearly legible and fully visible label on all new football helmets stating the football helmet's original date of manufacture and warning consumers that a football helmet's ability to protect the wearer can decline over time.

(6) **DATE OF RECONDITIONING LABEL FOR RECONDITIONED HELMETS.**—A standard for a clearly legible and fully visible label on all reconditioned football helmets stating the helmet's last date of reconditioning, its original date of manufacture, and warning consumers that a football helmet's ability to protect the wearer can decline over time, despite being properly and regularly reconditioned.

(c) SAFETY STANDARDS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall—

(A) in consultation with representatives of coaches, consumer groups, engineers, medical experts, school sports directors, scientists, and sports equipment standard-setting organizations, examine and assess the effectiveness of any voluntary consumer product safety standards for youth football helmets, reconditioned football helmets, and new football helmet concussion resistance proposed by a voluntary standards-setting organization; and

(B) in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, promulgate consumer product safety standards that—

(i) are substantially the same as such voluntary standards; or

(ii) are more stringent than such voluntary standards, if the Commission determines that more stringent standards would further reduce the risk of injury associated with football helmets.

(2) **TIMETABLE FOR RULEMAKING.**—If the Commission does not make an affirmative determination under subsection (a) within the 9-month period, the Commission shall commence the rulemaking required by subsection (b) within 30 days after the end of that 9-month period. The Commission shall periodically review and revise the standards set forth in the consumer product safety rule prescribed pursuant to that proceeding to ensure that such standards provide the highest level of safety for football helmets that is feasible.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF THIRD PARTY TESTING AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS TO YOUTH FOOTBALL HELMETS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The third party testing and certification requirements of section 14(a)(2) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2063(a)(2)) shall apply to any youth football helmet (including a reconditioned youth football helmet) to which any consumer product safety rule prescribed under section 3(b) of this Act applies as if the helmet were a children's product that is subject to a children's product safety rule without regard to the age of the individual for whom it is primarily designed or intended.

(b) **SPECIAL APPLICATION OF DEFINITION OF CHILDREN'S PRODUCT FOR PURPOSES OF TESTING AND CERTIFICATION OF FOOTBALL HELMETS.**—For the exclusive purpose of applying

the definition of the term “children’s product” in section 3(a)(2) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(2)) to the requirements of subsection (a) of this section, “18 years” shall be substituted for “12 years” each place it appears.

(c) For the purposes of this section, third party testing and certification shall be conducted by a testing laboratory that has an accreditation—

(1) that meets International Organization for Standardization/International Electrotechnical Commission standard 17025:2005 entitled *General Requirements for the Competence of Testing and Calibration Laboratories* (or any successor standard that is from an accreditation body that is signatory to the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation for testing accreditation);

(2) that meets International Organization for Standardization/International Electrotechnical Commission Guide 65:1996 entitled *General Requirements for Bodies Operating Product Certification Systems* (or any successor standard that is from an accreditation body that is signatory to the International Accreditation Forum for product certification accreditation); and

(3) that includes all appropriate football helmet standards and test methods within the scope of the accreditation.

SEC. 5. FALSE OR MISLEADING CLAIMS WITH RESPECT TO ATHLETIC SPORTING ACTIVITY GOODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is unlawful for any person to sell, or offer for sale, in interstate commerce, or import into the United States for the purpose of selling or offering for sale, any item of equipment intended, designed, or offered for use by an individual engaged in any athletic sporting activity, whether professional or amateur, for which the seller or importer, or any person acting on behalf of the seller or importer, makes any false or misleading claim with respect to the safety benefits of such item.

(b) ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Violation of subsection (a), or any regulation prescribed under this section, shall be treated as a violation of a rule under section 18 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a) regarding unfair or deceptive acts or practices. The Federal Trade Commission shall enforce this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(2) REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission may promulgate such regulations as it finds necessary or appropriate under this Act under section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates subsection (a) or any regulation prescribed under that section, shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated in and made part of this Act.

(4) AUTHORITY PRESERVED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

(c) ENFORCEMENT BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.—

(1) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging a violation of subsection (a) or any regulation issued under that section that affects or may affect such State or its residents may bring an action on behalf of the

residents of the State in any United States district court for the district in which the defendant is found, resides, or transacts business, or wherever venue is proper under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code, to obtain appropriate injunctive relief.

(2) INITIATION OF CIVIL ACTION.—A State shall provide prior written notice to the Federal Trade Commission of any civil action under paragraph (1) together with a copy of its complaint, except that if it is not feasible for the State to provide such prior notice, the State shall provide such notice immediately upon instituting such action.

(3) INTERVENTION BY THE COMMISSION.—The Commission may intervene in such civil action and upon intervening—

(A) be heard on all matters arising in such civil action; and

(B) file petitions for appeal of a decision in such civil action.

(4) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(A) to prevent the attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general, or other authorized State officer, by the laws of such State; or

(B) to prohibit the attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, from proceeding in State or Federal court on the basis of an alleged violation of any civil or criminal statute of that State.

(5) LIMITATION.—No separate suit shall be brought under this subsection if, at the time the suit is brought, the same alleged violation is the subject of a pending action by the Federal Trade Commission or the United States under this section.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 602. A bill to require regulatory reform; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, yesterday I offered three amendments to the SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Bill to make commonsense reforms to our regulatory system. Today, Senators ROBERTS and BARRASSO join me in offering the “CURB Act”—which stands for “Clearing Unnecessary Regulatory Burdens.” This legislation combines the provisions of those three amendments to force federal agencies to cut the red tape that impedes job growth.

As I explained yesterday, all too often it seems Federal agencies do not take into account the impacts to small businesses and job growth before imposing new rules and regulations. The bill we are introducing today obligates them to do so.

The CURB Act does three things: first, it requires Federal agencies to analyze the indirect costs of regulations, such as the impact on job creation, the cost of energy, and consumer prices.

Presently, Federal agencies are not required by statute to analyze the indirect cost regulations can have on the public, such as higher energy costs, higher prices, and the impact on job creation. However, Executive Order 12866, issued by President Clinton in 1993, obligates agencies to provide the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs with an assessment of the indirect costs of proposed regulations. Our bill would essentially codify this provi-

sion of President Clinton’s Executive Order.

Second, the CURB Act obligates Federal agencies to comply with public notice and comment requirements and prohibits them from circumventing these requirements by issuing unofficial rules as “guidance documents.”

After President Clinton issued Executive Order 12866, Federal agencies found it easier to issue so-called “guidance documents,” rather than formal rules. Although these guidance documents are merely an agency’s interpretation of how the public can comply with a particular rule, and are not enforceable in court, as a practical matter they operate as if they are legally binding. Thus, they have been used by agencies to circumvent OIRA regulatory review and public notice and comment requirements.

In 2007, President Bush issued Executive Order 13422, which contained a provision closing this loophole by imposing “Good Guidance Practices” on Federal agencies, which requires them to provide public notice and comment for significant guidance documents. Our bill would essentially codify this provision of President Bush’s Executive Order.

Third, the CURB Act helps out the “little guy” trying to navigate our incredibly complex and burdensome regulatory environment. So many small businesses don’t have a lot of capital on hand. When a small business inadvertently runs afoul of a Federal regulation for the first time, that first penalty could sink the business and all the jobs it supports. Our bill would provide access to SBA assistance to small businesses in a situation where they face a first-time, non-harmful paperwork violation. It simply doesn’t make sense to me to punish small businesses the first time they accidentally fail to comply with paperwork requirements, so long as no harm comes from that failure.

Each of these provisions has been endorsed by the National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, and the Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council. I urge my colleagues to support the CURB Act, which contains these important reforms to our regulatory system.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 103—PROVIDING FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 103

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Mr. Schumer, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Alexander, and Mr. Chambliss.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Schumer, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Alexander, and Mr. Cochran.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 229. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

SA 230. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 231. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 232. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 233. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 234. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. KERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 235. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 236. Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 237. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 238. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 239. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 240. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 241. Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 242. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 243. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 493, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 229. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR pro-

grams, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 116, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 504. PATRIOT EXPRESS LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a)(31) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(31)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) PATRIOT EXPRESS LOAN PROGRAM.—

“(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘eligible member of the military community’—

“(I) means—

“(aa) a veteran, including a service-disabled veteran;

“(bb) a member of the Armed Forces on active duty who is eligible to participate in the Transition Assistance Program;

“(cc) a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces;

“(dd) the spouse of an individual described in item (aa), (bb), or (cc) who is alive;

“(ee) the widowed spouse of a deceased veteran, member of the Armed Forces, or member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who died because of a service-connected (as defined in section 101(16) of title 38, United States Code) disability; and

“(ff) the widowed spouse of a deceased member of the Armed Forces or member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces relating to whom the Department of Defense may provide for the recovery, care, and disposition of the remains of the individual under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 1481(a) of title 10, United States Code; and

“(II) does not include an individual who was discharged or released from the active military, naval, or air service under dishonorable conditions.

“(ii) LOAN GUARANTEES.—The Administrator shall establish a Patriot Express Loan Program, under which the Administrator may guarantee loans under this paragraph made by express lenders to eligible members of the military community.

“(iii) LOAN TERMS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this clause, a loan under this subparagraph shall be made on the same terms as other loans under the Express Loan Program.

“(II) USE OF FUNDS.—A loan guaranteed under this subparagraph may be used for any business purpose, including start-up or expansion costs, purchasing equipment, working capital, purchasing inventory, or purchasing business-occupied real estate.

“(III) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The Administrator may guarantee a loan under this subparagraph of not more than \$1,000,000.

“(IV) GUARANTEE RATE.—The guarantee rate for a loan under this subparagraph shall be the greater of—

“(aa) the rate otherwise applicable under paragraph (2)(A);

“(bb) 85 percent for a loan of not more than \$500,000; and

“(cc) 80 percent for a loan of more than \$500,000.”.

(2) GAO REPORT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “programs” means—

(i) the Patriot Express Loan Program under section 7(a)(31)(G) of the Small Business Act, as added by paragraph (1); and

(ii) the increased veteran participation pilot program under section 7(a)(33) of the Small Business Act, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the

House of Representatives a report on the programs.

(C) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subparagraph (B) shall include—

(i) the number of loans made under the programs;

(ii) a description of the impact of the programs on members of the military community eligible to participate in the programs;

(iii) an evaluation of the efficacy of the programs;

(iv) an evaluation of the actual or potential fraud and abuse under the programs; and

(v) recommendations for improving the Patriot Express Loan Program under section 7(a)(31)(G) of the Small Business Act, as added by paragraph (1).

(b) FEE REDUCTION.—Section 7(a)(18) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(18)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “With respect to” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraph (C), with respect to”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) MILITARY COMMUNITY.—For an eligible member of the military community (as defined in paragraph (31)(G)(i)), the fee for a loan guaranteed under this subsection, except for a loan guaranteed under subparagraph (G) of paragraph (31), shall be equal to 75 percent of the fee otherwise applicable to the loan under subparagraph (A).”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SMALL BUSINESS ACT.—Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (33); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (34) and (35) as paragraphs (33) and (34), respectively.

(2) SMALL BUSINESS JOBS ACT OF 2010.—Section 1133(b) of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-240; 124 Stat. 2515) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) by striking paragraph (33), as redesignated by section 504(c) of the SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2011; and

“(2) by redesignating paragraph (34), as redesignated by section 504(c) of the SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2011, as paragraph (33).”.

(d) REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENT PRINTING COSTS.—

(1) STRATEGY AND GUIDELINES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall coordinate with the heads of the Executive departments and independent establishments, as those terms are defined in chapter 1 of title 5, United States Code—

(A) to develop a strategy to reduce Government printing costs during the 10-year period beginning on September 1, 2011; and

(B) to issue Government-wide guidelines for printing that implements the strategy developed under subparagraph (A).

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In developing the strategy under paragraph (1)(A), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the heads of the Executive departments and independent establishments shall consider guidelines for—

(i) duplex and color printing;

(ii) the use of digital file systems by Executive departments and independent establishments; and

(iii) determine which Government publications might be made available on Government Web sites instead of being printed.

(B) ESSENTIAL PRINTED DOCUMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall ensure that printed versions of documents that the Director determines are

essential to individuals entitled to or enrolled for benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or enrolled for benefits under part B of such title, individuals who receive old-age survivors' or disability insurance payments under title II of such Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and other individuals with limited ability to use or access the Internet have access to printed versions of documents that the Director are available after the issuance of the guidelines under paragraph (1)(B).

SA 230. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows.

Strike section 501 and insert the following:

SEC. 501. NATIONALLY IMPORTANT RESEARCH TOPICS AND CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) **SBIR PROGRAM.**—Section 9(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “critical technologies” and all that follows and inserting the following: “nationally important research topics or critical technologies, including nationally important research topics or critical technologies identified by the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee;” and

(2) by adding after paragraph (12), as added by section 111(a) of this Act, the following:

“(13) encourage applications under the SBIR program (to the extent that the projects relate to the mission of the Federal agency)—

“(A) from small business concerns in geographic areas underrepresented in the SBIR program or located in rural areas (as defined in section 1393(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986);

“(B) small business concerns owned and controlled by women;

“(C) small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans;

“(D) small business concerns owned and controlled by Native Americans; and

“(E) small business concerns located in a geographic area with an unemployment rates that exceed the national unemployment rate, based on the most recently available monthly publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.”.

(b) **STTR PROGRAM.**—Section 9(o) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(o)), as amended by section 111(b) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “critical technologies” and all that follows and inserting the following: “nationally important research topics or critical technologies, including nationally important research topics or critical technologies identified by the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee;”

(2) in paragraph (15), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in paragraph (16), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(17) encourage applications under the STTR program (to the extent that the projects relate to the mission of the Federal agency)—

“(A) from small business concerns in geographic areas underrepresented in the STTR program or located in rural areas (as defined in section 1393(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986);

“(B) small business concerns owned and controlled by women;

“(C) small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans;

“(D) small business concerns owned and controlled by Native Americans; and

“(E) small business concerns located in a geographic area with an unemployment rates that exceed the national unemployment rate, based on the most recently available monthly publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.”.

(c) **NATIONALLY IMPORTANT RESEARCH TOPICS AND CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.**—

(1) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding after subsection (mm), as added by section 503 of this Act, the following:

“(nn) **BIENNIAL REPORT ON NATIONALLY IMPORTANT RESEARCH TOPICS AND CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.**—

“(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than October 1, 2012, and every 2 years thereafter, the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report that identifies nationally important research topics and critical technologies. For purposes of this subsection, a nationally important research topic or critical technology may include a research topic or technology that relates to nanotechnology, rare diseases, security, energy, transportation, improving the security and quality of the water supply of the United States, or the efficiency of water delivery systems.

“(B) **CONTENTS.**—Each report required under subparagraph (A) shall include, for each research topic or critical technology identified in the report—

“(i) the reasons the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee selected the research topic or technology;

“(ii) the state of the development of the research topic or technology in the United States and in other countries; and

“(iii) an estimate of the current and anticipated level of research and development efforts in the United States concerning the research topic or technology.

“(C) **MAXIMUM NUMBER OF NATIONALLY IMPORTANT RESEARCH TOPICS AND CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.**—A report submitted under subparagraph (A) may not identify more than 30 research topics and technologies as nationally important research topics or critical technologies.

“(2) **DETERMINATION OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.**—

“(A) **DETERMINATION.**—The Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee may identify a research topic or technology as a nationally important research topic or critical technology if the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee determines it is essential for the United States to develop the research topic or technology to further the long-term national security or economic prosperity of the United States.

“(B) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In making a determination under subparagraph (A), the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee shall consider—

“(i) reports by the National Academies of Science; and

“(ii) other nationally recognized strategic plans, strategies, or roadmaps.”.

(2) **PROSPECTIVE REPEAL.**—Effective September 30, 2016, section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by this subsection, is amended—

(A) in subsection (g)(3), by striking “, including nationally important research topics or critical technologies identified by the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee”; and

(B) in subsection (o)(3), by striking “, including nationally important research topics

or critical technologies identified by the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee”; and

(C) by striking subsection (nn).

SA 231. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2011” or the “REINS Act”.

(b) **FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(A) Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress.

(B) Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes.

(C) By requiring a vote in Congress, this Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the people of the United States for the laws imposed upon them.

(2) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this Act is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process.

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.**—Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

“Sec.

“801. Congressional review.

“802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.

“803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.

“804. Definitions.

“805. Judicial review.

“806. Exemption for monetary policy.

“807. Effective date of certain rules.

“§ 801. Congressional review

“(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

“(i) a copy of the rule;

“(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

“(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

“(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

“(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

“(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

“(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any;

“(ii) the agency's actions under title 5 of the United States Code, sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609;

“(iii) the agency’s actions under sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532, 1533, 1534, and 1535); and

“(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

“(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date as provided in section 802(b)(2). The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency’s compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B).

“(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General’s report under subparagraph (A).

“(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

“(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

“(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

“(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

“(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

“(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

“(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

“(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

“(C) necessary for national security; or

“(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

“(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

“(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

“(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days, or

“(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

“(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

“(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

“(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day, or

“(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

“(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

“(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

“(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

“§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

“(a) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution introduced on or after the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That Congress approves the rule submitted by the ___ relating to ___.’ (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

“(1) In the House, the majority leader of the House of Representatives (or his designee) and the minority leader of the House of Representatives (or his designee) shall introduce such joint resolution described in subsection (a) (by request), within 3 legislative days after Congress receives the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A).

“(2) In the Senate, the majority leader of the Senate (or his designee) and the minority leader of the Senate (or his designee) shall introduce such joint resolution described in subsection (a) (by request), within 3 session days after Congress receives the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A).

“(b)(1) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(2) For purposes of this section, the term ‘submission date’ means the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1).

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is

referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e)(1) In the House of Representatives, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th legislative day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

“(2)(A) A motion in the House of Representatives to proceed to the consideration of a resolution shall be privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

“(B) Debate in the House of Representatives on a resolution shall be limited to not more than two hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion to further limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote by which a resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

“(C) Motions to postpone, made in the House of Representatives with respect to the consideration of a resolution, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

“(D) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to a resolution shall be decided without debate.

“(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in

subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply with respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

“(1) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

“(2) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

“(g) The enactment of a resolution of approval does not serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, does not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule.

“(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

“(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

“§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

“(a) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.’ (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

“(b)(1) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

“(2) For purposes of this section, the term ‘submission or publication date’ means the later of the date on which—

“(A) the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); or

“(B) the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against

consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e) In the Senate the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

“(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date, or

“(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

“(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

“(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

“(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

“(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

“(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

“§ 804. Definitions

“For purposes of this chapter—

“(1) the term ‘Federal agency’ means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1);

“(2) the term ‘major rule’ means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

“(A) an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more;

“(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

“(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets;

“(3) the term ‘nonmajor rule’ means any rule that is not a major rule; and

“(4) the term ‘rule’ has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

“(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

“(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

“(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

“§ 805. Judicial review

“(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

“(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

“§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

“Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

“§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

“Notwithstanding section 801—

“(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

“(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.”.

SA 232. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 9, strike “2019” and insert “2025”.

On page 4, line 17, strike “2019” and insert “2025”.

SA 233. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 27, line 21, strike the quotation marks and the second period and insert the following:

“(5) PREFERENCE FOR PHASE III AWARDS.—To the greatest extent practicable, in making Phase III awards, Federal agencies and Federal prime contractors shall give preference to applicants that will carry out projects in the United States.”.

On page 49, line 16, strike “and”.

On page 49, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) developing, manufacturing, and commercializing in the United States new commercial products and processes resulting from such projects.”;

On page 54, line 4, strike the quotation marks and the second period and insert the following:

“(7) INCENTIVES FOR DOMESTIC TESTING AND PRODUCTION.—In carrying out the Commercialization Readiness Program, the Secretary of Defense shall give preference to research programs that—

“(A) test products or services in the United States; and

“(B) would allow the Department of Defense to fulfill the requirements under chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘Buy American Act’)”.

On page 56, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

“(5) INCREASING DOMESTIC CAPABILITIES.—In carrying out a pilot program, the head of a covered Federal agency shall give preference to applicants that intend to test, develop, manufacture or commercialize a product or service in the United States.

On page 56, line 16, strike “(5)” and insert “(6)”.

On page 57, line 1, strike “(6)” and insert “(7)”.

On page 57, line 4, strike “(7)” and insert “(8)”.

On page 60, line 7, after “processes,” insert the following: “giving preference to research conducted in the United States.”.

On page 91, line 20, strike “and” at the end.

On page 91, strike line 22 and insert the following:

award; and

“(4) whether the small business concern or individual receiving the Phase III award is developing, testing, producing, or manufacturing the product or service that is the subject of the Phase III award in the United States.”.

On page 105, line 2, strike “and”.

On page 105, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(C) ways for Federal agencies to create incentives for recipients of awards under the SBIR program and the STTR program to carry out research, development, testing, production, manufacturing, and commercialization in the United States; and

On page 107, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

SEC. 316. GAO STUDY AND REPORT ON DOMESTIC PRODUCTION, MANUFACTURING, AND COMMERCIALIZATION.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study that—

(A) determines the amount of production, manufacturing, and commercialization in the United States that resulted from awards under the SBIR and STTR programs during the applicable period; and

(B) estimates the number of jobs created as a result of awards under the SBIR and STTR programs during the applicable period; and

(2) submit a report to Congress that contains the results of the study under paragraph (1), together with recommendations, if any, for how to use the SBIR and STTR programs to increase production, manufacturing, and commercialization in the United States.

(b) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—In this section, the term “applicable period” means, for each report submitted under paragraph (2), the 3-year period ending on the date that is 30 days before the date of the report.

On page 115, line 8, insert after “programs” the following: “, including the impact on production and manufacturing in the United States”.

SA 234. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. KERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—SMALL BUSINESS BROADBAND AND EMERGING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENTS

SEC. 601. BROADBAND AND EMERGING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COORDINATOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 45 as section 46; and

(2) by inserting after section 44 the following:

“SEC. 45. BROADBAND AND EMERGING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘broadband and emerging information technology coordinator’ means the individual assigned the broadband and emerging information technology coordination responsibilities of the Administration under subsection (b)(1).

“(b) ASSIGNMENT OF COORDINATOR.—

“(1) ASSIGNMENT OF COORDINATOR.—The Administrator shall assign responsibility for coordinating the programs and activities of the Administration relating to broadband and emerging information technology to an individual who—

“(A) shall report directly to the Administrator;

“(B) shall work in coordination with—

“(i) the chief information officer, the chief technology officer, and the head of the Office of Technology of the Administration; and

“(ii) any Associate Administrator of the Administration determined appropriate by the Administrator;

“(C) has experience developing and implementing telecommunications policy in the private sector or government; and

“(D) has demonstrated significant experience in the area of broadband or emerging information technology.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF COORDINATOR.—The broadband and emerging information technology coordinator shall—

“(A) coordinate programs of the Administration that assist small business concerns in adopting, making innovations in, and using broadband and other emerging information technologies;

“(B) serve as the primary liaison of the Administration to other Federal agencies involved in broadband and emerging information technology policy, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Communications Commission; and

“(C) identify best practices relating to broadband and emerging information technology that may benefit small business concerns.

“(3) TRAVEL.—Not more than 20 percent of the hours of service by the broadband and emerging information technology coordinator during any fiscal year shall consist of travel outside the United States to perform official duties.

“(c) BROADBAND AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGY TRAINING.—

“(1) TRAINING.—The Administrator shall provide to employees of the Administration training that—

“(A) familiarizes employees of the Administration with broadband and other emerging information technologies; and

“(B) includes—

“(i) instruction counseling small business concerns regarding adopting, making innovations in, and using broadband and other emerging information technologies; and

“(ii) information on programs of the Federal Government that provide assistance to small business concerns relating to broadband and emerging information technologies.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

“(d) REPORTS.—

“(1) BIENNIAL REPORT ON ACTIVITIES.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Administrator makes the first assignment of responsibilities under subsection (b), and every 2 years thereafter, the broadband and emerging information technology coordinator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report regarding the programs and activities of the Administration relating to broadband and other emerging information technologies.

“(2) REPORT ON FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2011, the broadband and emerging information technology coordinator, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, and the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on the programs of the Federal Government that provide assistance to small business concerns relating to broadband and emerging information technologies, which shall include recommendations, if any, for improving coordination among the programs.”.

(b) ELIMINATION OF VACANT POSITION REQUIRED.—

(1) ELIMINATION.—Before assigning the first broadband and emerging technologies coordinator under section 45 of the Small Business Act, as added by subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator shall—

(A) identify a position within the Administration that is—

(i) vacant on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) required to be filled by an employee in the Senior Executive Service or at GS-15 of the General Schedule; and

(B) eliminate the position identified under subparagraph (A).

(2) RESTRICTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the Administrator may not eliminate a position established by the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.), the Small Business Investment Act 1958 (15 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), or any other Federal statute.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by section 205(b) shall have no force or effect.

(2) PROSPECTIVE REPEAL OF ACCELERATING CURES PILOT PROGRAM.—Effective 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking section 43, as added by section 205(a); and

(B) by redesignating sections 44, 45 (as added by subsection (a)), and 46 (as redesignated by subsection (a)) as sections 43, 44, and 45, respectively.

SEC. 602. ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT.

Section 21(c)(3)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “accessing broadband and other emerging information technology,” after “technology transfer;”;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in clause (iii), by adding “and” at the end; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) increasing the competitiveness and productivity of small business concerns by assisting entrepreneurs in accessing broadband and other emerging information technology;”.

SEC. 603. CAPITAL ACCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “(including to purchase equipment for broadband or other emerging information technologies)” after “equipment”.

(b) MICROLOANS.—Section 7(m)(1)(A)(iii)(I) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(1)(A)(iii)(I)) is amended by inserting “(including to purchase equipment for broadband or other emerging information technologies)” after “or equipment”.

SEC. 604. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on ways to assist with the development of broadband and wireless technology that would benefit small business concerns.

(b) CONTENT OF THE REPORT.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall—

(1) outline the participation by the Administration in the National Antenna Program, including the number of wireless towers deployed on facilities which contain an office of the Administration;

(2) information on agreements between the Administration and the General Services Administration related to broadband and wireless deployment in offices of the Administration; and

(3) recommendations, if any, on opportunities for the Administration to improve broadband or wireless technology in offices of the Administration that are in areas currently underserved or unserved by broadband service providers.

SA 235. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SMALL BUSINESS INTERMEDIARY LENDING PILOT PROGRAM TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

Section 7(1)(4)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(1)(4)(B)) is amended by inserting “under the Program” after “to the eligible intermediary by the Administrator”.

SA 236. Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . GREENHOUSE GAS-RELATED EXEMPTIONS FROM PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to ensure that the greenhouse gas emissions from certain sources will not require a permit under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.); and

(2) to exempt greenhouse gas emissions from certain agricultural sources from permitting requirements under that Act.

(b) AMENDMENT.—Title III of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 329. GREENHOUSE GAS-RELATED EXEMPTIONS FROM PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) DEFINITION OF GREENHOUSE GAS.—In this section, the term ‘greenhouse gas’ means any of the following:

“(1) Carbon dioxide.

“(2) Methane.

“(3) Nitrous oxide.

“(4) Sulfur hexafluoride.

“(5) Hydrofluorocarbons.

“(6) Perfluorocarbons.

“(7) Nitrogen trifluoride.

“(8) Any other anthropogenic gas, if the Administrator determines that 1 ton of the gas has the same or greater effect on global climate change as does 1 ton of carbon dioxide.”

“(b) NEW SOURCE REVIEW.—

“(1) MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF AIR POLLUTANT.—For purposes of determining whether a stationary source is a major emitting facility under section 169(1) or has undertaken construction pursuant to section 165(a), the term ‘air pollutant’ shall not include any greenhouse gas unless the gas is subject to regulation under this Act for reasons independent of the effects of the gas on global climate change.

“(2) THRESHOLDS FOR EXCLUSIONS FROM PERMIT PROVISIONS.—No requirement of part C of title I shall apply with respect to any greenhouse gas unless the gas is subject to regulation under this Act for reasons independent of the effects of the gas on global climate change or the gas is emitted by a stationary source—

“(A) that is—

“(i) a new major emitting facility that will emit, or have the potential to emit, greenhouse gases in a quantity of at least 75,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year; or

“(ii) an existing major emitting facility that undertakes construction which increases the quantity of greenhouse gas emissions, or which results in emission of greenhouse gases not previously emitted, of at least 75,000 tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year; and

“(B) that has greenhouse gas emissions equal to or exceeding 250 tons per year in mass emissions or, in the case of any of the types of stationary sources identified in section 169(1), 100 tons per year in mass emissions.

“(3) AGRICULTURAL SOURCES.—In calculating the emissions or potential emissions of a source or facility, emissions of greenhouse gases that are subject to regulation under this Act solely on the basis of the effect of the gases on global climate change shall be excluded if the emissions are from—

“(A) changes in land use;

“(B) the raising of commodity crops, stock, dairy, poultry, or fur-bearing animals, or the growing of fruits or vegetables; or

“(C) farms, plantations, ranches, nurseries, ranges, orchards, and greenhouses or other similar structures used primarily for the raising of agricultural or horticultural commodities.

“(c) TITLE V OPERATING PERMITS.—Notwithstanding any provision of title III or title V, no stationary source shall be required to apply for, or operate pursuant to, a permit under title V, solely on the basis of the emissions of the stationary source of greenhouse gases that are subject to regulation under this Act solely on the basis of the effect of the greenhouse gases on global climate change, unless those emissions from that source are subject to regulation under this Act.”.

SA 237. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(a) PROHIBITION ON PRINTING THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking section 903 and inserting the following:

“§ 903. Congressional Record: daily and permanent forms

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The public proceedings of each House of Congress as reported by the Official Reporters, shall be included in the Congressional Record, which shall be issued in daily form during each session and shall be revised and made electronically available promptly, as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, for distribution during and after the close of each session of Congress. The daily and the permanent Record shall bear the same date, which shall be that of the actual day’s proceedings reported. The Government Printing Office shall not print the Congressional Record.

“(b) ELECTRONIC AVAILABILITY.—

“(1) GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.—The Government Printing Office shall make the Congressional Record available to the Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives in an electronic form in a timely manner to ensure the implementation of paragraph (1).

“(2) WEBSITE.—The Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives shall make the Congressional Record available—

“(A) to the public on the websites of the Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) in a format which enables the Congressional Record to be downloaded and printed by users of the website.”.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 905, in the first sentence, by striking “printing” and inserting “inclusion”; and

(B) by striking sections 906, 909, and 910.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 906, 909, and 910.

SA 238. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 116, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 504. DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL HIGH SPEED RAIL FUNDING NOT USED BY STATE TO WHICH IT WAS ALLOCATED.

Amounts allocated to any State under the Federal Railroad Administration's High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program that are not used by that State—

(1) shall be deposited into the General Fund of the Treasury to reduce that national deficit; and

(2) may not be reallocated to another qualifying State for any high speed rail project.

SA 239. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 116, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 504. ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE SECURITY ASSESSMENTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Transportation Security Administration is not authorized to conduct security assessments on hazardous material trucking companies that are similar to the security contact reviews conducted by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

SA 240. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. SURETY BONDS.

(a) **MAXIMUM BOND AMOUNT.**—Section 411(a)(1) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(a)(1)) is amended by striking “(1)” and all that follows and inserting the following: “(1)(A) The Administration may, upon such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, guarantee and enter into commitments to guarantee any surety against loss resulting from a breach of the terms of a bid bond, payment bond, performance bond, or bonds ancillary thereto, by a principal on any total work order or contract amount at the time of bond execution that does not exceed \$5,000,000.

“(B) The Administrator may guarantee a surety under subparagraph (A) for a total work order or contract amount that does not exceed \$10,000,000, if a contracting officer of a Federal agency certifies that such a guarantee is necessary.”.

(b) **DENIAL OF LIABILITY.**—Section 411 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) **REIMBURSEMENT OF SURETY; CONDITIONS.**—Pursuant to any such guarantee or agreement, the Administration shall reimburse the surety, as provided in subsection (c) of this section, except that the Administration shall be relieved of liability (in whole or in part within the discretion of the Administration) if—

“(1) the surety obtained such guarantee or agreement, or applied for such reimbursement, by fraud or material misrepresentation;

“(2) the total contract amount at the time of execution of the bond or bonds exceeds \$5,000,000;

“(3) the surety has breached a material term or condition of such guarantee agreement; or

“(4) the surety has substantially violated the regulations promulgated by the Administration pursuant to subsection (d).”;

(2) by striking subsection (k); and

(3) by adding after subsection (i) the following:

“(j) **DENIAL OF LIABILITY.**—For bonds made or executed with the prior approval of the Administration, the Administration shall not deny liability to a surety based upon material information that was provided as part of the guaranty application.”.

(c) **SIZE STANDARDS.**—Section 410 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694a) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (9); and

(2) adding after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any rule, regulation, or order of the Administration, for purposes of sections 410, 411, and 412 the term ‘small business concern’ means a business concern that meets the size standard for the primary industry in which such business concern, and the affiliates of such business concern, is engaged, as determined by the Administrator in accordance with the North American Industry Classification System.”.

SA 241. Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. NATIONAL PRIMARY DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **SMALL SYSTEM.**—The term “small system” means a public water system (as defined in section 1401 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f)) that serves not more than 10,000 individuals.

(b) **SUSPENSION OF ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to paragraph (2), none of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used for the enforcement of national primary drinking water regulations promulgated under the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.) until such date as the Administrator—

(A) implements a program to provide to small systems subject to those regulations, using the authority available to the Administrator under that Act, financial and technical assistance for use in complying with those regulations; and

(B) ensures that sufficient funds have been made available under this section to assist each small system in meeting requirements under those regulations.

(2) **CONTINUED SUSPENSION.**—If, after the date described in paragraph (1), a small system certifies to the Administrator that the small system lacks funds necessary to comply with the regulations referred to in paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Administrator shall suspend enforcement of the regulations (including any action to assess or collect a fine under the regulations) with respect to the small system for the fiscal year.

SA 242. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve

the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VI—SMALL BUSINESS LENDING ENHANCEMENT

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE; DEFINITIONS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This title may be cited as the “Small Business Lending Enhancement Act of 2011”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this title—

(1) the term “Board” means the National Credit Union Administration Board;

(2) the term “insured credit union” has the same meaning as in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

(3) the term “member business loan” has the same meaning as in section 107A(c)(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(1));

(4) the term “net worth” has the same meaning as in section 107A(c)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(2)); and

(5) the term “well capitalized” has the meaning given that term in section 216(c)(1)(A) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1709d(c)(1)(A)).

SEC. 602. LIMITS ON MEMBER BUSINESS LOANS.

Effective 6 months after the date of enactment of this title, section 107A(a) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **LIMITATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an insured credit union may not make any member business loan that would result in the total amount of such loans outstanding at that credit union at any one time to be equal to more than the lesser of—

“(A) 1.75 times the actual net worth of the credit union; or

“(B) 12.25 percent of the total assets of the credit union.

“(2) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.**—The Board may approve an application by an insured credit union upon a finding that the credit union meets the criteria under this paragraph to make 1 or more member business loans that would result in a total amount of such loans outstanding at any one time of not more than 27.5 percent of the total assets of the credit union, if the credit union—

“(A) had member business loans outstanding at the end of each of the 4 consecutive quarters immediately preceding the date of the application, in a total amount of not less than 80 percent of the applicable limitation under paragraph (1);

“(B) is well capitalized, as defined in section 216(c)(1)(A);

“(C) can demonstrate at least 5 years of experience of sound underwriting and servicing of member business loans;

“(D) has the requisite policies and experience in managing member business loans; and

“(E) has satisfied other standards that the Board determines are necessary to maintain the safety and soundness of the insured credit union.

“(3) **EFFECT OF NOT BEING WELL CAPITALIZED.**—An insured credit union that has made member business loans under an authorization under paragraph (2) and that is not, as of its most recent quarterly call report, well capitalized, may not make any member business loans, until such time as the credit union becomes well capitalized (as defined in section 216(c)(1)(A)), as reflected in a subsequent quarterly call report, and obtains the approval of the Board.”.

SEC. 603. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) **TIERED APPROVAL PROCESS.**—The National Credit Union Administration Board

shall develop a tiered approval process, under which an insured credit union gradually increases the amount of member business lending in a manner that is consistent with safe and sound operations, subject to the limits established under section 107A(a)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (as amended by this title). The rate of increase under the process established under this paragraph may not exceed 30 percent per year.

(b) **RULEMAKING REQUIRED.**—The Board shall issue proposed rules, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, to establish the tiered approval process required under subsection (a). The tiered approval process shall establish standards designed to ensure that the new business lending capacity authorized under the amendment made by section 2 is being used only by insured credit unions that are well-managed and well capitalized, as required by the amendments made under section 2, and as defined by the rules issued by the Board under this subsection.

(c) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In issuing rules required under this section, the Board shall consider—

(1) the experience level of the institutions, including a demonstrated history of sound member business lending;

(2) the criteria under section 107A(a)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended by this title; and

(3) such other factors as the Board determines necessary or appropriate.

SEC. 604. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON MEMBER BUSINESS LENDING.

(a) **REPORT OF THE BOARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall submit a report to Congress on member business lending by insured credit unions.

(2) **REPORT.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the types and asset size of insured credit unions making member business loans and the member business loan limitations applicable to the insured credit unions;

(B) the overall amount and average size of member business loans by each insured credit union;

(C) the ratio of member business loans by insured credit unions to total assets and net worth;

(D) the performance of the member business loans, including delinquencies and net charge offs;

(E) the effect of this title and the amendments made by this title on the number of insured credit unions engaged in member business lending, any change in the amount of member business lending, and the extent to which any increase is attributed to the change in the limitation in section 107A(a) of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended by this title;

(F) the number, types, and asset size of insured credit unions that were denied or approved by the Board for increased member business loans under section 107A(a)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended by this title, including denials and approvals under the tiered approval process;

(G) the types and sizes of businesses that receive member business loans, the duration of the credit union membership of the businesses at the time of the loan, the types of collateral used to secure member business loans, and the income level of members receiving member business loans; and

(H) the effect of any increases in member business loans on the risk to the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund and the assessments on insured credit unions.

(b) **GAO STUDY AND REPORT.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the status of member business lending by insured credit unions, including—

(A) trends in such lending;

(B) types and amounts of member business loans;

(C) the effectiveness of this section in enhancing small business lending;

(D) recommendations for legislative action, if any, with respect to such lending; and

(E) any other information that the Comptroller General considers relevant with respect to such lending.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress on the study required by paragraph (1).

SA 243. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 73, at the end, add the following:

SEC. 209. INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CLEAN TECHNOLOGY.**—The term “clean technology” means—

(A) technology that improves energy efficiency, including—

(i) technologies to reduce energy consumption;

(ii) energy-efficient building technologies and applications; and

(iii) efficient electricity transmission, distribution, and electrical grid-based storage;

(B) technology relating to energy storage;

(C) fuel cells and batteries; and

(D) component technologies for electric vehicles.

(2) **RENEWABLE ENERGY.**—The term “renewable energy” means energy generated from any of the following:

(A) Solar, wind, geothermal, or ocean based sources.

(B) Biomass, biofuels, or feedstock.

(C) Landfill gas.

(D) Municipal solid waste.

(E) Incremental hydropower.

(F) Hydropower that has been certified by the Low Impact Hydropower Institute

(3) **SMALL- OR MEDIUM-SIZE HIGH GROWTH TECHNOLOGY COMPANY.**—The term “small- or medium-sized high growth technology company” means a small business concern that primarily engages in commerce in 1 or more of the following industries:

(A) Life sciences.

(B) Medical devices.

(C) Computer hardware.

(D) Computer software.

(E) Clean technology.

(F) Renewable energy generation and manufacturing.

(G) Such other industries as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

(5) **SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.**—The term “small business concern” has the meaning given that term under section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)).

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF INNOVATIVE PRODUCT LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish a loan guarantee program to help small- and medium-sized high growth technology companies who the Secretary determines—

(A) are operating in a phase of the business life cycle in which technological, market, or regulatory uncertainty constrains the amount of capital available from lenders and equity investors to such companies during such phase; and

(B) are unable to progress to the next phase of the business life cycle because of such constraints on the availability of capital.

(2) **DESIGNATION.**—The loan guarantee program established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the “Innovative Technology Development Loan Guarantee Program”.

(c) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may, under the program established pursuant to subsection (b)(1), guarantee the full or partial repayment of a loan that meets the requirements of this section.

(2) **GUARANTEE PERCENTAGE.**—For a loan guaranteed under the program established pursuant to subsection (b)(1), the Secretary may guarantee such percentage of such loan as the Secretary considers appropriate, except that such percentage shall be not less than 50 percent and not more than 90 percent.

(d) **LOAN REQUIREMENTS.**—A loan referred to in subsection (c) meets the requirements of this section if each of the following requirements is met:

(1) **PURPOSE.**—The loan is for—

(A) fixed assets relating to reequipping, expanding, or establishing a facility the Secretary considers necessary for the loan recipient to enter the next phase of the business life cycle; or

(B) providing the loan recipient with working capital the Secretary considers necessary for the loan recipient to enter the next phase of the business life cycle.

(2) **INTEREST RATE.**—The interest rate for the loan does not exceed such maximum rate as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The loan has such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers commercially reasonable and consistent with prevailing market standards.

(4) **PRE-QUALIFIED LENDERS.**—The loan is offered by a lender who has been pre-qualified under subsection (e).

(e) **PRE-QUALIFICATION OF LENDERS.**—The Secretary shall pre-qualify lenders who—

(1) are nongovernmental entities who specialize in providing financing to high growth technology companies; and

(2) the Secretary determines will expedite the loan process and are competent to carry out credit underwriting, loan origination, loan documentation, loan administration, and loan servicing under the program established pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(f) **SYNDICATION.**—A lender offering a loan that is guaranteed under the program established pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall agree not to syndicate or assign the loan unless—

(1) the loan is syndicated or assigned to a third party financial institution that the Secretary considers qualified;

(2) the lender retains a pre-specified portion of the unguaranteed credit risk; and

(3) the lender continues to perform as the servicing and administrative agent for the loan.

(g) **DEFAULT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of a default on a loan guaranteed under this section, the lender shall have the right of first refusal to serve as workout and collection agent for purposes of such default and under such terms as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(h) **FEES.**—The Secretary may establish such fees as the Secretary considers necessary to cover the costs of administering the program established under subsection (b)(1).

(i) INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund known as the “Innovative Technology Development Fund” (in this subsection referred to as the “Fund”).

(2) ELEMENTS.—There shall be deposited in the fund the following, which shall constitute the assets of the Fund:

(A) Amounts paid into the Fund under any provision of law or regulation established by the Secretary imposing fees under subsection (h).

(B) All other amounts received by the Secretary incident to operations relating to the loan guarantee program established under subsection (b)(1).

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—The Fund shall be available to the Secretary, without fiscal year limitation, to carry out the provisions of this section.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 210. INTERNET WEBSITE PROMOTING COMMERCIALIZATION OF TECHNOLOGY IDEAS INVENTED BY FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCHERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall, acting through the Director of the National Institute for Standards and Technology, establish and maintain an Internet website that connects Federally funded researchers who have ideas for technologies that they believe could be commercialized with persons who express interest in working with Federally-funded researchers on the commercialization of their technologies.

(b) PARTICIPATION OPTIONAL.—Participation of a Federally-funded researcher in the Internet website required by subsection (a) shall be optional.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the establishment of the Internet website required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on such Internet website.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The status of the Internet website required by subsection (a).

(B) An assessment of such Internet website.

(C) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for improvements to the Internet website and any additional funding or legislative action as the Secretary considers necessary to implement such improvements.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out this section \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2015. Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 211. LIMITATION ON GOVERNMENT PRINTING COSTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall coordinate with the heads of Federal departments and independent agencies to—

(1) determine which Government publications could be available on Government Internet websites and no longer printed and to devise a strategy to reduce overall Government printing costs over the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2011, except that the Director shall ensure that essential printed documents prepared for social security recipients, medicare beneficiaries, and other populations in areas with limited

Internet access or use continue to remain available;

(2) establish government-wide Federal guidelines on employee printing; and

(3) issue on the Office of Management and Budget's public Internet website the results of a cost-benefit analysis on implementing a digital signature system and on establishing employee printing identification systems, such as the use of individual employee cards or codes, to monitor the amount of printing done by Federal employees; except that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall ensure that Federal employee printing costs unrelated to national defense, homeland security, border security, national disasters, and other emergencies do not exceed \$860,000,000 annually.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Thursday, April 14, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to review S. 343 a bill to amend Title I of PL 99-658 regarding the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau, to approve the results of the 15-year review of the Compact, including the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Palau following the Compact of Free Association Section 432 Review, to appropriate funds for the purposes of the amended PL 99-658 for fiscal years ending on or before September 30, 2024, and to carry out the agreements resulting from that review.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150, or by e-mail to Abigail_Campbell@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Al Stayman or Abigail Campbell.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation be authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to hold a hearing entitled, “The State of Online Consumer Privacy.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011, at 10 a.m. in SD-406.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Health Reform: Lessons Learned During the First Year.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011, at 9 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, “Intelligence Update on Libya.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011, at 10:15 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled, “Afghanistan: Progress and Expectations.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011, at 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 16, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011. The Committee will meet in room SDG-50 in the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2011, from 2-4 p.m. in Hart 216.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 48

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon, on Thursday, March 17, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 20, H.J. Res. 48, a 3-week continuing resolution; that there be up to 3 hours of debate, equally divided between the two leaders or designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the joint resolution be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of the joint resolution; that there be no amendments in order to the joint resolution prior to the vote, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57 and 58 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the

Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Purl K. Keen

The following named officer for appointment as the Chief of Staff, United States Army, and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 3033:

To be general

Gen. Martin E. Dempsey

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Joseph L. Votel

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Chaplains, United States Army, and appointment to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 3036:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Donald L. Rutherford

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Donald M. Campbell, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Thomas L. Conant

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John F. Kelly

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. James P. Wisecup

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Joseph D. Kernan

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S
DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN278 AIR FORCE nominations (14) beginning DAVID LEWIS BUTTRICK, and ending

THEODORE L. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN279 AIR FORCE nominations (20) beginning MARTIN D. ADAMSON, and ending JOHN MARION VON ALMEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN311 AIR FORCE nominations (13) beginning CHRISTIAN R. SCHLICHT, and ending KAMEKEA C. WILLIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2011.

IN THE ARMY

PN264 ARMY nomination of Stacy J. Taylor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 16, 2011.

PN265 ARMY nominations (90) beginning TEMIDAYO L. ANDERSON, and ending ALLEN P. ZENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 16, 2011.

PN280 ARMY nomination of Paul L. Robson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN281 ARMY nomination of Brian M. Boyce, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN282 ARMY nomination of Jan I. Maby, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN283 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JASON K. BURGMAN, and ending CODY D. WHITTINGTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN284 ARMY nominations (4) beginning LEE A. BURNETT, and ending ROBERT A. MARSH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN285 ARMY nominations (6) beginning KENNETH P. DONNELLY, and ending RICHARD J. VANARNAM, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN286 ARMY nominations (12) beginning KEVIN J. MCCANN, and ending GORDON E. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN287 ARMY nominations (15) beginning JOHN S. KUTTAS, and ending WESLEY G. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN312 ARMY nomination of Nicole K. Avci, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2011.

PN313 ARMY nomination of Edmond K. Safarian, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2011.

PN314 ARMY nominations (2) beginning CHARLES L. CLARK, and ending RUSSELL D. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2011.

PN327 ARMY nominations (6) beginning ERIK M. BENDA, and ending SETH D. MIDDLETON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 9, 2011.

PN328 ARMY nominations (7) beginning KEVIN B. DENNEHY, and ending GREGORY A. THINGVOLD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 9, 2011.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN177 MARINE CORPS nomination of Daniel A. Sierra, which was received by the

Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2011.

PN196 MARINE CORPS nomination of Jeffrey S. Forbes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2011.

IN THE NAVY

PN258 NAVY nominations (2) beginning GARRY W. LAMBERT, and ending BRYAN P. RASMUSSEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011.

PN259 NAVY nominations (23) beginning KARIN E. THOMAS, and ending LESLIE A. WALDMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011.

PN289 NAVY nomination of Daniel A. Freilich, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 28, 2011.

PN315 NAVY nominations (2) beginning Richard T. Grossart, and ending Andrew G. Mortimer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2011.

PN316 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JOHN A. SALVATO, and ending JAY A. FERNS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2011.

PN331 NAVY nomination of Brandon M. Oberling, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 9, 2011.

PN332 NAVY nominations (3) beginning WILLIAM A. BROWN, JR., and ending HARPREET SINGH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 9, 2011.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of H.J. Res. 48, the continuing resolution, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 11; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without any intervening action or debate on calendar No. 11; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF A STATUE OF GERALD R. FORD

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 27 which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) providing for the acceptance of a statue of Gerald R. Ford from the people of Michigan for placement in the United States Capitol.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Senate is poised to approve a concurrent resolution providing for the acceptance of a statue of President Gerald R. Ford to be placed in the Capitol. I am proud as a Michigander, and proud as an American, to support this resolution.

In this turbulent moment, it is good to remember that this is not the first time our Nation has faced adversity. At another time—a time of distress and doubt and anguish—Gerald Ford assumed our Nation's highest office. We were fortunate indeed that at that time of great danger, Jerry Ford was there to take the helm and keep our country on an even keel.

President Ford's courage in the performance of his duties and his willingness to act in the Nation's interest even when it brought criticism were the capstone of a lifetime of service. As a young Navy officer during World War II, this son of Grand Rapids served his Nation with distinction. In December 1944, when a great typhoon and fire threatened Ford's ship, he demonstrated the courage and cool judgment that would serve him so well in Congress and the White House.

Gerald Ford served Michigan and his country for 13 terms as a Member of the House of Representatives, earning bipartisan respect. He became Vice President at a time of great controversy, but it was in navigating the storm that brought him to the Presidency that he provided his greatest service. At a time when our nation needed healing, he was a healer. When we needed unity, he was our unifying force.

The people of Michigan are proud to call Gerald Ford one of our own. Placement of this statue, a gift from the people of Michigan, in the Rotunda of the Capitol on May 3, will be a fitting tribute to his service.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the measure be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) was agreed to.

IN SUPPORT OF REDUCING THE SENATE'S BUDGET BY AT LEAST 5 PERCENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further

consideration of S. Res. 94 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 94) to express the sense of the Senate in support of reducing its budget by at least 5 percent.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the resolution be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 94

Whereas, the current level Federal spending is unsustainable and action to reverse this course should not be delayed;

Whereas, in 2010, Federal spending was nearly 24 percent of the value of all the goods and services produced in the United States;

Whereas, the Federal deficit was over \$1 trillion in fiscal year 2010;

Whereas, Federal spending is at its highest percentage since World War II;

Whereas, the Congressional Budget Office estimates if the United States maintains its current track of Federal spending, the Federal debt would reach 90 percent of the value of all the goods and services produced in the United States by 2020;

Whereas, the national debt exceeds \$13.9 trillion dollars;

Whereas, the United States borrows \$44,000 for every person in the country;

Whereas, the unemployment rate was 9.8 percent in December;

Whereas, the American people have responded to the economic downturn by making hard choices and trimming their family budgets;

Whereas, spending in the legislative branch rose nearly 50 percent over the last 10 years; and

Whereas, in order to address the Nation's fiscal crisis, the Senate should lead by example and reduce its own legislative budget: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it should lead by example and reduce the budget of the Senate by at least 5 percent.

PROVIDING FOR MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 103, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 103) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the

Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 103) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 103

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Mr. Schumer, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Alexander, and Mr. Chambliss.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Schumer, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Alexander, and Mr. Cochran.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2011

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 17, St. Patrick's Day; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that following any leader remarks, there be a period for the transaction of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 493, the small business jobs bill; and finally, that at 12 noon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 48, the 3-week continuing resolution, as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, rollcall votes in relation to amendments to the small business bill are possible tomorrow morning. Senators should also expect two rollcall votes at approximately 3 p.m. in relation to the continuing resolution and on the confirmation of the Jackson nomination to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before

the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:06 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 17, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

MARY GEIGER LEWIS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA, VICE HENRY F. FLOYD.

JANE MARGARET TRICHE-MILAZZO, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA, VICE MARY ANN VIAL LEMMON, RETIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBERT W. CONE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN SANDRA E. ADAMS
CAPTAIN MARK L. LEAVITT
CAPTAIN JON G. MATHESON
CAPTAIN KERRY M. METZ
CAPTAIN JOHN F. WEIGOLD

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL K. PYLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JANET MANNING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JOHN H. BARKEMEYER
NED BARTLEBAUGH
JASON B. BLAKE
JAY K. CLARK
PRIMITIVO R. DAVIS
DARYL W. DENSFORD
RAYMOND L. ESTES
SHARREN S. FISCHER
EMMITT M. FURNER II
SETH H. GEORGE
THOMAS E. GIDLEY
BRADLEY C. GODDING
CHARLES D. GORDON
WILLIAM E. GRAHAM
ERIK J. GRAMLING
FRANTISEK HALKA
MEGAN E. HODGE
CLAUDE E. HOFFMAN
JOHN V. JECOMA
STANISLAW JASIURKOWSKI
JERRY E. JOHNSON
PETER E. KEOUGH
SAMUEL E. KIM
BRIAN G. KOYN
PHILIP A. KRAMER
MARK C. LEE
JOSH L. LLANO
LUIS E. LOPEZCOLON
VINCENT MANUEL
WILLIE MASHACK
JEFF S. MATSLER
SCOT W. MCCOSH
LUCILIO G. MIZERANI
CHRISTOPHER P. MOELLERING
SEAN A. MOORE
LEO MORAS
SCOTT E. NICHOLS
DOUGLAS A. OCHNER
KELLY L. OLEAR
CHRISTOPHER C. OPARA
JAMES Y. PENNINGTON
SHANNON K. PHILIO
MYUNG Y. RYU
DAVID J. SNYDER
ERIK T. SPICER
MICHAEL W. SPIKES

JASON R. TOBIN
ARTHUR D. VANDERVELDE
VALERIA R. VANDRESS
LARRY M. VANHOOK
WALLACE J. WALDROP, JR.
RICHARD W. WEST
STEVEN K. WHITE
PAUL D. WILBOURN
DONALD A. WILLIAMSON
DANIEL H. WILSON
YAN XIONG
D010566

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16, 2011:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. PURL K. KEEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 3033:

To be general

GEN. MARTIN E. DEMPSEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOSEPH L. VOTEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 3036:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DONALD L. RUTHERFORD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DONALD M. CAMPBELL, JR.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS L. CONANT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN F. KELLY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES P. WISECUP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOSEPH D. KERNAN

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID LEWIS BUTTRICK AND ENDING WITH THEODORE L. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARTIN D. ADAMSON AND ENDING WITH JOHN MARION VON ALMEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTIAN R. SCHLICHT AND ENDING WITH KAMEKEA C. WILLIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 4, 2011.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF STACY J. TAYLOR, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TEMIDAYO L. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH ALLEN P. ZENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 16, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PAUL L. ROBSON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRIAN M. BOYCE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAN I. MABY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON K. BURGMAN AND ENDING WITH CODY D. WHITTINGTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LEE A. BURNETT AND ENDING WITH ROBERT A. MARSH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KENNETH P. DONNELLY AND ENDING WITH RICHARD J. VANARNAM, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN J. MCCANN AND ENDING WITH GORDON E. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN S. KUTTAS AND ENDING WITH WESLEY G. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NICOLE K. AVCI, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF EDMOND K. SAFARIAN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES L. CLARK AND ENDING WITH RUSSELL D. TAYLOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 4, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIK M. BENDA AND ENDING WITH SETH D. MIDDLETON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 9, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN B. DENNEHY AND ENDING WITH GREGORY A. THINGVOLD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 9, 2011.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF DANIEL A. SIERRA, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JEFFREY S. FORBES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GARRY W. LAMBERT AND ENDING WITH BRYAN P. RASMUSSEN, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 14, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KARIN E. THOMAS AND ENDING WITH LESLIE A. WALDMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 14, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DANIEL A. FREILICH, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD T. GROSSART AND ENDING WITH ANDREW G. MORTIMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 4, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN A. SALVATO AND ENDING WITH JAY A. FERNS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 4, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRANDON M. OBERLING, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM A. BROWN, JR. AND ENDING WITH HARPREET SINGH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 9, 2011.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING RUTH BEAVERS

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to congratulate Ruth Beavers for being selected as a recipient of the Daily Point of Light Award. This award is a testament that Ruth is a true leader for her volunteer service to St. Francis Medical Center in Monroe, LA.

Ruth joined the St. Francis Medical Center volunteer program in 2000. As of September 30, 2010, she has devoted 7,764 hours of service to St. Francis Medical Center. Ruth has continually demonstrated the mission of St. Francis Medical Center by her commitment to reaching out to others in their time of need. She has brought comfort and hope to patients and their families with her sincere concern for their welfare.

During this past decade, Ruth has dedicated her time, talent and energy to helping others. Her commitment to service is a true example of citizenship. She is truly an unsung hero to St. Francis Medical Center and the St. Francis Volunteer program. Her compassion and faithful service to St. Francis Medical Center's patients, families, and staff exemplifies the best in volunteerism.

She is an example of how one person can change the lives of many, and I commend Ruth for her hard work and dedication to making a positive difference in the community. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mrs. Ruth Beavers for this significant achievement.

HONORING MRS. MARGARET ANN RUSSELL ON HER EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the eightieth birthday of a distinguished member of Missouri's 4th Congressional District, Mrs. Margaret Ann Russell. Mrs. Russell, of Lebanon, Missouri, will celebrate her birthday March 22nd surrounded by family and friends; I join them in commending her role as a faithful family servant and community pillar.

Born on March 22, 1931 to George T. and Vesta Carr, Margaret grew up rooted in the values of rural America. She graduated from Lebanon High School in Lebanon, Missouri, and went on to attend the historic Stephens College in Columbia, Missouri, an institution dedicated since 1833 to the education and cultivation of female leaders.

Mrs. Russell married John T. Russell, also of Lebanon, Missouri, who served in the Missouri House of Representatives and the Missouri Senate for almost forty years. She labored diligently to raise their three children Doug, Jeanette, and Melissa. John, Jason,

Jordan, Jimmy, Nicole, Makenzie, and Audrey have been blessed to know her as their grandmother; now, Harper and Drew have the special privilege of knowing her as their great grandmother.

While prioritizing her family, Mrs. Russell has long been involved in public service as well. She is an active part of the First Baptist Church of Lebanon. She also has encouraged local candidates to pursue public office, has given insight to community leaders, and has worked to strengthen her hometown. Recognizing the key role private citizens can play in protecting children, she consistently supports the Missouri Baptist Children's Home.

I applaud Mrs. Russell for her quiet service in support of family and a vibrant local community. The diligent attention she has given to civil society should inspire us all. It is with sincere admiration that I wish her a very happy birthday on this milestone occasion.

CONGRATULATING JIM REED OF PHILADELPHIA FOR A LIFE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jim Reed, a respected and beloved member of the greater Philadelphia business and civic community, who will be honored on April 14, 2011, at The Enterprise Center, 4548 Market Street, in West Philadelphia.

Mr. Reed is Director of External Affairs for Verizon Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. His service to his community both includes and extends far beyond the workplace. An active and passionate leader, Jim Reed is committed to the well-being of children, youth and adults alike. From board participation to teaching; mentoring, community service and advocating for change, he has proven his commitment to the community.

Mr. Reed is a native of Savannah, Georgia, and was educated in Savannah and the School District of Philadelphia. He is a graduate of The Pennsylvania Institute of Technology and Spring Garden College. He was a math instructor at Dobbins and Edison High Schools in Philadelphia, the Opportunities Industrial Center, founded by Leon Sullivan, and Temple University.

Jim Reed has more than 45 years experience in all facets of telecommunications. He began his career with AT&T and then transferred to Bell of Pennsylvania where he moved to the External Affairs Department as Community Relations Director, and assumed his current position in 1993.

Mr. Reed's community involvement includes a wide range of interests and activities. He has chaired the Mayor's Commission on Services to the Aging. He is an active board member of the Urban Affairs Coalition, West Philadelphia Partnership, Korean Community Center, Citizens Crime Commission, The Men of the 644th Engineer Battalion "C," and many other organizations.

Jim Reed is an active member of Tindley Temple United Methodist Church where he serves as an usher. He is a member of the Methodist Men, and also a board member of Charles A. Tindley Community Development Corporation.

He has been honored by countless organizations including OIC, Philadelphia Chinatown Development Corporation, Asian American Women Coalition, Cheyney University, Berean Institute, Operation PUSH, Teenagers In Charge, Concerned Black Men, City of Philadelphia, Frontiers International, the Ducky Birts Foundation, Haddington, Multi-Service Center for Older Adults, Grands As Parents, and many others. He is a concerned community advocate in the Wynnefield neighborhood where he resides.

Jim Reed is an exemplary Philadelphian who has earned the admiration and gratitude of all who know him—and will get to know him as he continues his service—in Philadelphia. I offer my warm and sincere congratulations to Jim Reed for a life well lived and brimming with accomplishment.

WEST POINT FOUNDERS DAY 2011

HON. NAN A.S. HAYWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the 19th District of New York is home to the United States Military Academy and today I join the cadets and alumni of West Point in celebrating Founders Day. On March 16, 1802, President Thomas Jefferson signed into law the Military Peace Establishment Act that founded the United States Military Academy at West Point. Since then, over 50,000 men and women have joined the Long Gray Line and served in the United States Army in times of war and peace. This year, approximately 1,000 cadets will be commissioned as Second Lieutenants and continue a great Army tradition dedicated to Duty, Honor, Country. Their deep and enduring patriotism; their tenacity, talent, and sacrifice, make the United States Army the greatest in the world. May God continue to protect them in their mission to preserve our peace and freedom every day.

HONORING MEMBERS OF 3RD BATTALION, 135TH THEATER AVIATION BATTALION OF LEBANON, MISSOURI

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the safe return of an 11-member

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

section of the Missouri National Guard's Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3rd Battalion, 135th Theater Aviation Battalion, of Lebanon, MO. I want to commend them for their selfless service and sacrifice over the past year of their deployment to Joint Base Balad, Iraq, in support of Operation New Dawn.

They were tasked with providing 24-hour-a-day command and control, supervision, staff planning, personnel service and logistical support to all units attached to the theater aviation battalion. The unit used fixed-wing aircraft to provide services to a forward deployed aviation. This allowed for the air movement of cargo, personnel, and dignitaries from the United States, NATO, and Iraq.

The section of returning Soldiers is commanded by Capt. Seth Everett, who lives in St. Louis, MO. Other members of the unit live in Lebanon, Eldon, Versailles, Linn Creek, Mountain Grove, Dixon, Liberal, Dexter, Hallsville, and Jefferson City. The unit was previously deployed to Balad in 2005.

Without soldiers like those in the 3–135th, we would not enjoy the freedoms we have today, and I am eternally grateful for their service. It is only fitting that they return home safely to their families and loved ones.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in welcoming home the members of the 3–135th, and thanking them for their continued sacrifice as members of the Armed Forces.

HONORING MS. BRIDGETTE DIXON
THURMAN

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, Ms. Bridgette Dixon Thurman has given of herself as an educator of Dunaire Elementary, a daughter, a mother and friend; and

Whereas, Ms. Thurman has been chosen as this year's Teacher of the Year, representing Dunaire Elementary school; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents for the betterment of our community and our Nation through her tireless works, motivational speeches and words of wisdom; and

Whereas, Ms. Thurman is a virtuous woman, a courageous woman and a fearless leader who has shared with the world her vision and passion to help ensure that our future, our children, receive an education that is relevant for today, but also for the future; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Bridgette Dixon Thurman for her leadership and service for our District;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 23, 2011 as Ms. Bridgette Dixon Thurman Day in the 4th Congressional District. Proclaimed, this 23rd day of March, 2011.

52ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE TIBETAN NATIONAL UPRISING DAY

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, March 10 marked the 52nd anniversary of the Tibetan uprising against the People's Republic of China, during which His Holiness the Dalai Lama fled into exile. On that day, there was a small commemoration on Library Mall in Madison with Wisconsin's Tibetan-American community, which my staff was honored to attend. While the commemoration serves as a painful but important reminder of China's prolonged efforts to outlaw dissent, restrict free expression, and violently occupy Tibet, it also serves as a symbol of our sustained vigilance, continued determination, and enduring hope that Tibetans everywhere will soon be free to live in peace with their land and culture intact.

On this anniversary, I offer support and conviction to the thousands of Tibetans living in exile and the thousands more who have chosen to stand beside them in the struggle for freedom. I support the Middle-Way Approach proposed by His Holiness the Dalai Lama to honor the dignity of both Tibetan and Chinese people and to promote a respectful solution. I strongly believe that the United States has a responsibility to stand up for human rights and the rule of law, and I support efforts to address the plight of Tibetans.

The Dalai Lama issued a statement on March 10, as he does every year, which represents a "state of the union" speech for Tibetans. This year's statement was newsworthy, in that the Dalai Lama announced that he intends to hand over the last vestiges of his governmental responsibilities to the elected leadership of the Tibetan Government in exile, while remaining a committed advocate for the Tibet cause. At a time when despots around the world cling to power as their people yearn for democracy, the Dalai Lama's willful ceding of power is a tribute to his vision to fulfill the aspirations of the Tibetan people and should inspire others around the world.

I insert the Dalai Lama's March 10, 2011, statement into the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HIS HOLINESS THE DALAI LAMA
ON THE 52ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE TIBETAN
NATIONAL UPRISING DAY, MARCH 9, 2011

Today marks the 52nd anniversary of the Tibetan people's peaceful uprising of 1959 against Communist China's repression in the Tibetan capital Lhasa, and the third anniversary of the non-violent demonstrations that took place across Tibet in 2008. On this occasion, I would like to pay tribute to and pray for those brave men and women who sacrificed their lives for the just cause of Tibet. I express my solidarity with those who continue to suffer repression and pray for the well-being of all sentient beings.

For more than sixty years, Tibetans, despite being deprived of freedom and living in fear and insecurity, have been able to maintain their unique Tibetan identity and cultural values. More consequentially, successive new generations, who have no experience of free Tibet, have courageously taken responsibility in advancing the cause of Tibet. This is admirable, for they exemplify the strength of Tibetan resilience.

This Earth belongs to humanity and the People's Republic of China (PRC) belongs to

its 1.3 billion citizens, who have the right to know the truth about the state of affairs in their country and the world at large. If citizens are fully informed, they have the ability to distinguish right from wrong. Censorship and the restriction of information violate basic human decency. For instance, China's leaders consider the communist ideology and its policies to be correct. If this were so, these policies should be made public with confidence and open to scrutiny.

China, with the world's largest population, is an emerging world power and I admire the economic development it has made. It also has huge potential to contribute to human progress and world peace. But to do that, China must earn the international community's respect and trust. In order to earn such respect China's leaders must develop greater transparency, their actions corresponding to their words. To ensure this, freedom of expression and freedom of the press are essential. Similarly, transparency in governance can help check corruption. In recent years, China has seen an increasing number of intellectuals calling for political reform and greater openness. Premier Wen Jiabao has also expressed support for these concerns. These are significant indications and I welcome them.

The PRC is a country comprising many nationalities, enriched by a diversity of languages and cultures. Protection of the language and culture of each nationality is a policy of the PRC, which is clearly spelt out in its constitution. Tibetan is the only language to preserve the entire range of the Buddha's teachings, including the texts on logic and theories of knowledge (epistemology), which we inherited from India's Nalanda University. This is a system of knowledge governed by reason and logic that has the potential to contribute to the peace and happiness of all beings. Therefore, the policy of undermining such a culture, instead of protecting and developing it, will in the long run amount to the destruction of humanity's common heritage.

The Chinese government frequently states that stability and development in Tibet is the foundation for its long-term well-being. However, the authorities still station large numbers of troops all across Tibet, increasing restrictions on the Tibetan people. Tibetans live in constant fear and anxiety. More recently, many Tibetan intellectuals, public figures and environmentalists have been punished for articulating the Tibetan people's basic aspirations. They have been imprisoned allegedly for "subverting state power" when actually they have been giving voice to the Tibetan identity and cultural heritage. Such repressive measures undermine unity and stability. Likewise, in China, lawyers defending people's rights, independent writers and human rights activists have been arrested. I strongly urge the Chinese leaders to review these developments and release these prisoners of conscience forthwith.

The Chinese government claims there is no problem in Tibet other than the personal privileges and status of the Dalai Lama. The reality is that the ongoing oppression of the Tibetan people has provoked widespread, deep resentment against current official policies. People from all walks of life frequently express their discontentment. That there is a problem in Tibet is reflected in the Chinese authorities' failure to trust Tibetans or win their loyalty. Instead, the Tibetan people live under constant suspicion and surveillance. Chinese and foreign visitors to Tibet corroborate this grim reality.

Therefore, just as we were able to send fact-finding delegations to Tibet in the late 1970s and early 1980s from among Tibetans in exile, we propose similar visits again. At the

same time we would encourage the sending of representatives of independent international bodies, including parliamentarians. If they were to find that Tibetans in Tibet are happy, we would readily accept it.

The spirit of realism that prevailed under Mao's leadership in the early 1950s led China to sign the 17-point agreement with Tibet. A similar spirit of realism prevailed once more during Hu Yaobang's time in the early 1980s. If there had been a continuation of such realism the Tibetan issue, as well as several other problems, could easily have been solved. Unfortunately, conservative views derailed these policies. The result is that after, more than six decades, the problem has become more intractable.

The Tibetan Plateau is the source of the major rivers of Asia. Because it has the largest concentration of glaciers apart from the two Poles, it is considered to be the Third Pole. Environmental degradation in Tibet will have a detrimental impact on large parts of Asia, particularly on China and the Indian subcontinent. Both the central and local governments, as well as the Chinese public, should realise the degradation of the Tibetan environment and develop sustainable measures to safeguard it. I appeal to China to take into account the survival of people affected by what happens environmentally on the Tibetan Plateau.

In our efforts to solve the issue of Tibet, we have consistently pursued the mutually beneficial Middle-Way Approach, which seeks genuine autonomy for the Tibetan people within the PRC. In our talks with officials of the Chinese government's United Front Work Department we have clearly explained in detail the Tibetan people's hopes and aspirations. The lack of any positive response to our reasonable proposals makes us wonder whether these were fully and accurately conveyed to the higher authorities.

Since ancient times, Tibetan and Chinese peoples have lived as neighbours. It would be a mistake if our unresolved differences were to affect this age-old friendship. Special efforts are being made to promote good relations between Tibetans and Chinese living abroad and I am happy that this has contributed to better understanding and friendship between us. Tibetans inside Tibet should also cultivate good relations with our Chinese brothers and sisters.

In recent weeks we have witnessed remarkable non-violent struggles for freedom and democracy in various parts of North Africa and elsewhere. I am a firm believer in non-violence and people-power and these events have shown once again that determined non-violent action can indeed bring about positive change. We must all hope that these inspiring changes lead to genuine freedom, happiness and prosperity for the peoples in these countries.

One of the aspirations I have cherished since childhood is the reform of Tibet's political and social structure, and in the few years when I held effective power in Tibet, I managed to make some fundamental changes. Although I was unable to take this further in Tibet, I have made every effort to do so since we came into exile. Today, within the framework of the Charter for Tibetans in Exile, the Kalon Tripa, the political leadership, and the people's representatives are directly elected by the people. We have been able to implement democracy in exile that is in keep with the standards of an open society.

As early as the 1960s, I have repeatedly stressed that Tibetans need a leader, elected freely by the Tibetan people, to whom I can devolve power. Now, we have clearly reached the time to put this into effect. During the forthcoming eleventh session of the fourteenth Tibetan Parliament in Exile, which

begins on 14th March, I will formally propose that the necessary amendments be made to the Charter for Tibetans in Exile, reflecting my decision to devolve my formal authority to the elected leader.

Since I made my intention clear I have received repeated and earnest requests both from within Tibet and outside, to continue to provide political leadership. My desire to devolve authority has nothing to do with a wish to shirk responsibility. It is to benefit Tibetans in the long run. It is not because I feel disheartened. Tibetans have placed such faith and trust in me that as one among them I am committed to playing my part in the just cause of Tibet. I trust that gradually people will come to understand my intention, will support my decision and accordingly let it take effect.

I would like to take this opportunity to remember the kindness of the leaders of various nations that cherish justice, members of parliaments, intellectuals and Tibet Support Groups, who have been steadfast in their support for the Tibetan people. In particular, we will always remember the kindness and consistent support of the people and Government of India and State Governments for generously helping Tibetans preserve and promote their religion and culture and ensuring the welfare of Tibetans in exile. To all of them I offer my heartfelt gratitude.

With my prayers for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

10 March 2011
Dharamsala

TAIWAN'S EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call my colleagues' attention to the continued exclusion of the Republic of China (Taiwan) from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

As we have witnessed far too often, Taiwan is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, having the natural environment of a subtropical island. In 2009, Taiwan was devastated by Typhoon Morakot. In just two days, a total of 2,500 mm of rain fell in Central and Southern Taiwan, the heaviest rain in over 50 years. Floods and landslides caused severe loss of life and property. Extreme weather events such as these, coupled with rising sea levels caused by global warming, are endangering Taiwan's environment and survival.

The fact that Taiwan is unable to use the resources of the UNFCCC seriously cripples Taiwan's efforts to meet the challenges posed by global warming and climate change. For the welfare of Taiwan's 23 million residents, it urgently needs to be included in the disaster early warning system, to have access to real-time information and to be part of climate change adaptation mechanisms.

This unjust exclusion not only hurts Taiwan, but it also hurts the global community, since Taiwan has a great deal to contribute to global environmental efforts. For nearly four decades, Taiwan has been developing a robust legal framework for environmental protection, beginning with the Water Pollution Control Act in 1974 and most recently in June 2009, with a

law advancing the development of renewable energy. Taiwan's Environmental Protection Agency has implemented measures to reduce greenhouse gas emission and has invited international agencies every year since 1993 to verify the volumes of Taiwan's production, import and export of ozone-depleting substances. Taiwan is also at the forefront of developing solar power, alternative fuels, and wind power, reducing vehicular emissions, improving air quality and managing solid waste.

Taiwan needs to be included in the UNFCCC and the world needs to include Taiwan. I urge my colleagues to support Taiwan's inclusion in the UNFCCC and I yield back the balance of my time.

A TRIBUTE TO WISCONSIN'S FABULOUS 14: "THEY STOOD UP"

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proudly recognize Wisconsin's Fabulous 14. These 14 Wisconsin State senators took a stand on behalf of the people in order to prevent legislation that would strip State public workers of most of their collective bargaining rights and sell off government power plants without bids. This legislation would also grant extraordinary powers to an unelected government official appointed by the Governor, who has been a staunch opponent of medical assistance his entire political career, to make drastic changes to Wisconsin's successful Badger Care, Family Planning programs, and Senior Care Programs.

These 14 courageous men and women, at great sacrifice to themselves and their families, fled to Illinois, to the land of Lincoln. In fact, these 14 Wisconsin Democratic Senators now share something in common with former Republican President, Abraham Lincoln. The then State Senator Lincoln left the Illinois Statehouse to prevent a quorum from being reached to hold a crucial vote in 1840. Lincoln reportedly opened a window and escaped from the second floor of the building. One newspaper joked that Lincoln's "long legs" prevented him from being injured as he left.

During the senators' absence, the people of Wisconsin were given an opportunity to review the Budget Repair Bill and the Budget Bill and thoroughly scrutinize its contents of the Governor's proposals. The bill will affect every citizen in Wisconsin, and for many middle class and vulnerable Wisconsinites; it will be devastating.

Governor Walker and Republicans in the State Legislature worked around the 14 senators' protest to prevent a quorum and the bill was signed into law on Friday, March 11, 2011. During the past 3 weeks, I have been in Madison on several occasions standing in solidarity with the people.

On Saturday, March 12, 2011, along with an estimated 100,000 people, I was on hand to Welcome Back "the Fabulous 14" who returned to the State after weeks. I could feel the energy, the intensity of the people of Wisconsin; teachers, nurses, students, plow drivers, fire-fighters, prison guards and dozens of farmers with their tractors gathered around the Capitol square. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin has

undergone an historic change; it was evident in the faces of Wisconsinites that visibly displayed their resolve and in their shouts of thank you. While this battle may be over, the war continues. I rise to give a hearty thank you to Wisconsin's Fabulous 14.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House floor during rollcall vote No. 177 taken on Tuesday, March 15. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

NATIONAL AHEC WEEK

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, March 14–18 marks National AHEC week. The Area Health Education Centers (AHEC) program was developed by Congress in 1971 to recruit, train and retain a health professions workforce. Today, 56 AHEC programs with more than 235 centers operate in almost every state and the District of Columbia. The AHEC program addresses the imbalances in our healthcare system and inequities in access to and quality of healthcare. Nearly 8,000 AHEC community based training sites are located in underserved areas including 3,500 in designated health professions shortage areas, training a workforce committed to serving underserved populations. This is accomplished by forming academic and community partnerships that link the resources of academic health centers with the needs of the communities. This unique program has continually exceeded HRSA's performance measure targets in terms of the percentage of program participants who are underrepresented minorities and from disadvantaged backgrounds; the proportion of participants that train in medically underserved communities; and the percentage of health professionals entering practice in underserved areas.

On this week, we celebrate the goals and ideals of the AHEC program as well as its innumerable contributions to the advancement of health care in our most underserved communities.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STARTUP VISA ACT OF 2011

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a new version of the StartUp Visa Act, a bill that would encourage innovation and economic growth by permitting immigrant

entrepreneurs greater access to temporary U.S. visas. The bill matches legislation introduced this week by Senators JOHN KERRY, RICHARD LUGAR, and MARK UDALL in the Senate.

What do American household names such as Google, eBay and Procter & Gamble have in common? They are all former start-ups founded by immigrants.

Our current visa laws have made it unnecessarily difficult for immigrants to launch new companies in the United States. I am reintroducing the StartUp Visa Act because the economic dynamism of foreign-born talent has always been a crucial factor in our country's growth, and we must take steps to enable it to continue. By allowing immigrant entrepreneurs greater access to American visas, we truly can drive American job creation and channel the power of innovation.

This legislation would be an expansion of the bill from last Congress, extending the pool of eligible immigrants to include holders of H-1B visas and entrepreneurs living outside the United States with a market presence in the country.

The entrepreneurial spirit is ingrained in our country's history and success. I believe that this legislation is a vital component of promoting our global competitiveness. We must ensure a strong foundation for foreign-born, highly-skilled talent to create American jobs and promote economic prosperity and this bill works toward that end.

HONORING TEXAS SOCIETY, SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution for their patriotism and preservation of our country's rich history. Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution members can trace their family heritage to the men and women who fought for our nation's independence. For 115 years, Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution has inspired our communities with the principles and promises of our nation's Founding Fathers.

On February 8, 1896, charter members from around Texas formed the Bernardo de Galvez Chapter of Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution. The founding members selected The Honorable Ira H. Evans as the first state president. In 1897, the first annual meeting was held with fifteen members. Today the organization has grown to incorporate sixty-six chapters across Texas and approximately ten thousand members.

Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution is actively involved in communities around Texas by sponsoring and hosting many charitable events such as essay, art, and oration contests for high school students. Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution recognizes ROTC, JROTC, Eagle Scouts, and others for hard work in the community. Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution also works closely with disabled veterans

in homes and hospitals around Texas. The organization honors the importance of the American Revolution through civic events where full color guard and revolutionary war uniforms are worn to commemorate our nation's founding.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in commending the Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution on its faithful service to our communities in Texas.

H.R. 1, FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks, hundreds of Minnesotans, as well as citizens from across the country, have contacted my office about the military's multi-million dollar taxpayer sponsorship of NASCAR race cars. Frankly, many of my constituents and citizens of all political persuasions—Democrats, Republicans, and Tea Party activists—are dumbfounded when race car drivers receive millions of dollars from the Department of Defense while the Speaker of the House of Representatives tells the American people our country is "broke."

Last month the House of Representatives voted to eliminate funding for homeless veterans, slash community health centers serving low income families, and pass a fiscal year 2011 budget that would force 800,000 Americans to lose their jobs. Yet, taxpayer funded sponsorship of NASCAR racing teams was protected. I find this absurd.

One of my constituents, a twelve-year-old young man named Nickolas of South Saint Paul, Minnesota, provided an eloquent rebuttal to these appalling priorities. Nickolas wrote my office saying:

Congresswomen Betty McCollum,

My name is Nickolas, and I am a Boy Scout working on my Citizenship in the Nation Merit Badge.

I read online that you wrote a bill to stop the Pentagon from sponsoring NASCAR race teams as a way to advertise. I agree that it is absurd that the Pentagon is funding NASCAR. We should put the money into NASA and jobs for people. NASA is more important than NASCAR.

If the government is going to pay to support a race, how about a race to Mars? America has already sent people to the moon, why not Mars? Instead of paying for people to go in circles, why not pay for people to go for Mars? Humans are explorers. We should go to answer questions about the Red Planet and the Solar System. In addition, the studies done to get to Mars will give us better technology here on earth.

Nickolas understands that scarce taxpayer dollars need to be invested in innovation, education, and exploration that will create new opportunities to expand our knowledge of space and our economy. I strongly encourage my colleagues to take Nickolas' advice and focus on cutting unnecessary government spending, like government sponsorship of NASCAR race cars while making sound investments in America's future.

HONORING MEMBERS OF THE
4175TH CID

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the safe return of 10 Missouri National Guardsmen from the 4175th Military Police Detachment Criminal Investigation Division.

The soldiers are returning from a nearly year-long deployment to Iraq and Afghanistan. They were responsible for conducting criminal investigations for the Army. The group consists of Soldiers from Jefferson City, Columbia, O'Fallon, High Ridge, Hannibal, and St. Charles. The unit commander is Chief Warrant Officer 2 Timothy Forney, of Hannibal, MO.

Without Soldiers like those in the 4175th CID, we would not enjoy the freedoms we have today, and I am eternally grateful for their service. It is only fitting that they return home safely to their families and loved ones.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in welcoming home the members of the 4175th CID, and thanking them for their continued sacrifice as members of the Armed Forces.

HONORING THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS CHAPTER 91 OF
DECATUR

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

Whereas, DeKalb County serves as home for many Veterans who have served honorably in the United States Military; and

Whereas, the Disabled American Veterans Chapter 91 of Decatur is an organization that continues to serve those who have represented our nation in times of peace and war; and

Whereas, our beloved county, continues to rely on the wisdom, leadership and service from the Disabled American Veterans to assist and build our community; and

Whereas, this unique organization has given of themselves tirelessly and unconditionally to preserve integrity and advocate strongly for our disabled veterans and their families; and

Whereas, the Disabled American Veterans Chapter 91 continues to serve our county by being the sword and shield of those who served our country in the United States military; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Disabled American Veterans Chapter 91 of Decatur, Georgia for their outstanding service to our District;

Now Therefore, I, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 20, 2011 as Disabled American Veterans Chapter 91 Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 20th day of March, 2011.

CONGRATULATIONS GORDY
FAMILY

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate my good friend Thomas Gordy and his wife Theresa on the birth of their son Trenton Talmadge Gordy. Trenton was born on Tuesday, February 15, 2011, in Manassas, Virginia. He is welcomed home by his sister Sarah Gordy.

Trenton Talmadge Gordy is seven pounds and one ounce of pride and joy to his loving grandparents, Timmy and Kay Gordy of Monroe, Louisiana, Toni and Michael LeBlanc of Shreveport, Louisiana, and Canoy and Lynn Mayo of West Monroe, Louisiana.

I am so excited for this new blessing to the Gordy family and wish them all the best.

HONORING GEOFFREY BREITKOPF

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride, but overwhelming grief, that I take to the floor today to honor one of my constituents who was taken from us far before his time, Officer Geoffrey Breitkopf.

When there is danger, there are two types of people. There are the majority of people who run from it, and then there are those brave few who run towards it. Officer Breitkopf was one of those brave few.

He served as a Nassau County Police Officer for more than 12 years, the majority of that time was spent serving in the elite Bureau of Special Operations. Always hard working, Officer Breitkopf earned a spot in the BSO in approximately half the time it normally takes. He was highly decorated for his various acts of bravery, including five Command Recognition Awards, four Meritorious Police Service Awards and one Medal of Commendation.

Despite having a family and an incredibly demanding job, Officer Breitkopf also found time to serve his community. He was a member of the Selden Fire Department for the past 15 years and served in the heavy rescue company, which handles search and rescue, house fires and extricating people from cars.

Tragically, Officer Breitkopf died in the line of duty, doing the job he loved so much and excelled at so well. My thoughts and prayers are with his fellow officers and his family, especially his wife, Paula, and their two sons Connor and Owen.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent a true hero like Officer Geoffrey Breitkopf and ask that we take a moment to reflect on his service to Long Island.

2011 BRAIN AWARENESS WEEK

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate Brain Awareness Week

(BAW) and the benefits of this informative week in educating students and the general public on brain science in my congressional district and across the country. Brain Awareness Week, launched in 1996, brings together the Society for Neuroscience, the Dana Alliance for Brain Initiatives, and 2400 other organizations in 76 countries who share a common goal of improving public awareness of brain and nervous system research. During Brain Awareness Week, which is being held March 14–20, neuroscientists around the globe educate K–12 students, senior citizens and the public at large on the wonders of the human brain. These activities include tours of neuroscience laboratories, museum exhibitions, and classroom discussions on elements of the human brain. This year, in my congressional district, high school students will have an opportunity to learn about brain physiology by working with Kent State University's graduate students to dissect a sheep's brain. This event will get these kids excited about the mysteries of the mind and the nature of scientific discovery. Today, in recognition of Brain Awareness Week, I would like to highlight a serious neurological disorder that affects millions of Americans—impacting their livelihoods and families: Addiction. In fact, 9 percent of Americans—more than 22 million people—abuse drugs on a regular basis.

As co-chair of the Congressional Addiction, Treatment and Recovery Caucus, I understand the urgency of treating addiction and the burden this neurological disorder has on lives, loved ones, and our economy. According to the U.S. Office of National Drug Control, each year, more than half a trillion dollars is lost to substance abuse in the United States alone. These losses are realized across the board—in health, criminal, and productivity-related areas. That impact totals about \$181 billion for illicit drugs, \$168 billion for tobacco, and \$185 billion for alcohol. Even more worrisome are the statistics on drug-induced mortality. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported that more than 38,000 people in the United States died of legal or illegal substances in 2006. That figure doesn't even include the 300,000 to 450,000 deaths each year attributed to nicotine addiction. As disturbing as these numbers are, they don't reflect the unquantifiable impact of drug abuse. Drug abuse dissolves families, shreds the social fabric in neighborhoods, leads to loss of jobs and income, contributes to poor school and job performance, and is often a causal factor in domestic violence and auto accidents.

Mr. Speaker, the consequences of substance abuse for children in society are especially tragic. Drug-addicted parents often don't properly care for their children, neglecting medical and educational needs, and failing to provide basic food and shelter. When parents fail, the government must step in. These deficits are ultimately made up for by the taxpayer. Although more than 75 percent of illicit drug users are employed, these adults are more likely to frequently change jobs, be involved in accidents, be absent, and be less productive even when at work. Notably, heavy drinkers are absent from work four to eight times more often than non-addicts. According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), drug use changes brain chemistry and physiology beyond just the brain's reward system and includes regions involved in memory,

learning, impulse control, stress reactivity, and more. Repeated drug exposure “resets” these circuits toward compulsive behavior so that a person’s control over the desire to seek and use drugs is compromised, despite devastating consequences.

Over the course of the last three decades, the scientific and medical communities have made amazing strides in the understanding and treatment of drug abuse and addiction. Combined biological, epidemiological, and social science discoveries have given us a detailed understanding of the risks, mechanisms, and consequences of drug abuse and addiction. Today, the rate of cigarette smoking in youth is at its lowest recorded point since tracking of teen drug use and attitudes began in 1975.

Marijuana use has shown a consistent decline since the mid-1990s, although that trend has flattened in recent years; a study released last month by NIDA found that daily use of marijuana among America’s youth is making a bold comeback—surpassing tobacco use.

Mr. Speaker, recent scientific advances have revolutionized our understanding of addiction as a chronic, relapsing, disease and not a moral failure. According to the NIDA scientists have now identified the specific sites of action in the brain where every major drug of abuse has its initial effects, including opiates, methamphetamine, cocaine, tobacco, and marijuana. Brain imaging technology has demonstrated that addiction is a brain disease by delineating profound disruptions in the specific brain circuits affected by addiction. In-depth, NIH-supported studies of chronic drug exposure confirmed that by causing abnormal regulation of key brain receptor, addictive drugs modify the strength of connections between neurons. The scientific knowledge we have accumulated will be used to transform the way we treat addiction and how we prevent drug abuse and its escalation to addiction. Neuroscientists are working to identify the genetic and environmental factors that put people at risk. For instance, genes account for about 50 percent of a person’s risk of becoming addicted, and environmental factors influence the effect of these genes. Progress in genetics research will lead to more refined prevention and treatment interventions targeted to individual risk or to modifiable environmental influences.

Now, it’s time for our policies to catch up with the research findings. We have to understand that addiction is a treatable disease requiring continuing care and multifaceted approaches, like diabetes, or heart and respiratory disease. We have to continue to support the research advancements by investing in a strong, sustainable research funding platform for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF) that will bring us further in understanding and treating drug abuse and addiction. Failure to properly address this growing problem will only lead to more lives ruined or extinguished by drugs, more families broken by abuse, and more taxpayer money squandered on ineffective programs.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Brain Awareness Week, which exposes our constituents to the wonders and mysteries of the brain. I also ask that you join me in continuing to support basic research funded through the NIH and NSF that provides a foundation for new addiction treat-

ments and drug abuse prevention methods that have an enormous impact on the lives of millions of Americans.

ROTA CULTURAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES STUDY ACT

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLÁN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating certain areas of prehistoric, historic, and natural significance on the island of Rota in the Northern Mariana Islands as a unit of the National Park System.

Rota is truly a “jewel,” as the gentlewoman from California, Ms. NAPOLITANO, called the island at last year’s hearing on this same bill. National Park Service representatives who conducted a reconnaissance survey there in 2004 reported that Rota has the best-preserved village sites of the ancient Chamorro people and that Rota’s native limestone forests provide habitat to locally and federally protected, rare bird species.

The House of Representatives approved the Rota Park study under suspension of the rules in July last year. There was no objection or controversy. But, unfortunately, the other body did not have time on its agenda to act before the 111th Congress ended.

Now, I ask that we quickly restart the process of having the Park Service study the suitability and feasibility of designating parts of Rota for a national park.

There are time pressures involved. Rota is at a crossroads. Major land use changes are possible resulting from development by the U.S. military on the neighboring island of Guam. We have to know which areas on Rota can be and need to be protected, so that the people of Rota can maintain the important cultural and natural features of their island while at the same time taking advantage of opportunities for economic development.

For these reasons the leaders of Rota support the study. The Honorable Teresita Santos, Rota’s representative in the Northern Mariana Islands House of Representatives, flew to Washington, DC to speak in support of the bill at the hearing by Natural Resources Subcommittee on Oceans, Wildlife and Insular Affairs last year.

The Mayor of Rota, the Honorable Melchor Mendiola, submitted his letter for the record during last year’s consideration of the bill in the House. He, too, supported passage.

Today, I am including another letter of support for the study bill. This letter is from the Honorable Paul S. Manglona, President of the Northern Mariana Islands Senate, who represents Rota in the Senate.

And, of course, the National Park Service reconnaissance survey also recommended that the cultural and natural resources are truly of national significance and that the appropriate next step is a suitability and feasibility study.

The people of Rota have done a tremendous job over the millennia in protecting the treasures of their remarkable island. Let us

support their efforts. Let us determine whether this “jewel” should be considered by Congress for inclusion in the National Park System.

I ask that my colleagues support the Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act.

THE SENATE,
NORTHERN MARIANAS COMMONWEALTH
LEGISLATURE,
Saipan, MP, March 15, 2011.

Hon. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLÁN,
Delegate, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN, I am writing to support the Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act (Act). The Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability of designating prehistoric, historic and limestone forest sites on Rota as a unit of the National Park System.

As testified to by Commonwealth Legislator Representative Teresita Santos for the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs, the Island of Rota is unique in the Marianas as the only primarily inhabited island spared fighting during World War II. Consequently, plant and animal life was spared the near total destruction similar on Saipan and Tinian.

Archaeologists describe Rota as having the most intact and numerous historic sites of any island in the Mariana Archipelago. Rota has the best examples in the Marianas of Latte houses, the ancient stone houses of the Chamorro culture. Four prehistoric sites on Rota are included in the Register of Historic Places, Monchon Archeological District, Taga Latte Stone Quarry, the Dugi Archeological Site, and the Chugai Pictograph Cave containing examples of ancient Chamorro rock art.

In addition to prehistoric sites, historic relics from the Japanese period—on the Historic Register of Historic Places—include Kohatsu Kabushiki Kaisha Sugar Mill, Japanese Coastal Defense Gun and the Japanese Hospital.

Natural resources are prevalent on Rota primarily due to its native limestone forests that provide habitat for federally endangered listed species including the Mariana crow and the Rota bridled white-eye birds, in addition to two (2) plant species endemic to Rota.

The National Park Service completed a preliminary resource assessment regarding Rota in 2005, concluding designating Rota as part of the national park system appeared to be the best way to ensure the long term protection of Rota’s pre-historic and historic natural and man-made habitat and structures. I strongly encourage you, along with the Rota Legislative Delegation, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability of designating prehistoric, historic and limestone forest sites on Rota as a unit of the National Park System.

Sincerely,
PAUL A. MANGLONA,
Senate President.

CONGRATULATING MR. RICHARD ORNELLAS FOR HIS COMMITMENT TO THE CLOSE UP WASHINGTON CIVIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Richard Ornellas, an outstanding

history and special education teacher at Molokai High School in my district. Mr. Ornellas's students are in Washington this week for the Close Up Washington Civic Education Program. The Close Up Foundation is presenting Mr. Ornellas with an award for his dedication to the program over many years.

I visited Molokai High School in 2008 for a discussion on teacher effectiveness. The group's participants shared their views that an effective teacher is one who is experienced, "helps you understand," and "makes it fun." Mr. Ornellas helped organize his Close Up students to raise funds for the trip by writing fundraising letters and selling plate lunches and food at the Molokai Hoe race. His students have even been blogging about their trip on the school website! For getting his students so excited to learn about our nation's history first-hand, I would definitely call Mr. Ornellas an effective teacher.

Mr. Ornellas is a strong supporter of this program, which gives students a first-hand experience with democracy in our nation's capital. Using the Close Up curriculum—tied to state history standards—Mr. Ornellas helps his students understand how our democracy works and inspires them to become more active in their school and community.

Over 95 percent of the program's 500,000 participants have reported that the program helped them better understand their roles as citizens.

I salute Mr. Ornellas for his dedication to providing a well-rounded civic education for his students. I am presenting him with a flag that flew over the U.S. Capitol in his honor.

Congratulations to Mr. Ornellas and the many students he has helped influence over the years.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF MT. MORIAH BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a very special occasion today—the 150th anniversary of the Mt. Moriah Baptist Church in Delta, Alabama.

The first mention of Mt. Moriah Baptist Church was on October 21, 1859. Mt. Moriah along with eight other churches met and organized what was then called the Boiling Springs Association.

According to Baptist Archives, Mt. Moriah Baptist Church was established by 1860. The first pastor was Hiram J. Hickey, First Deacon ordained was John Garrett and First Clerk was Eli Frost.

On May 3, 1890, church minutes state the previous conference minutes were destroyed by fire and could not be read. On September 1, 1890, membership consisted of 37 men and 65 women. Total funds were \$2.85, but Amazing Grace could still be heard through the church doors despite the hardships endured.

The church has been in three associations of the Southern Baptist Conference for a total of 150 years. When the Boiling Springs Association dissolved in October of 1898, after convening for 39 years, each church was granted a letter to join the Calhoun, Cleburne or Coosa River Association.

One month later 10 churches met at Ramah (now known as Delta Baptist Church) for the purpose of forming the Clay Association which Mt. Moriah became a part of. Association records show the Clay Association was founded on November 25, 1898. Mt. Moriah was recognized as one of two churches that were chartered founders of the Clay Association and were honored at the association meeting for the 100th Anniversary of the Founding of the Clay County Baptist Association in 1998. When the Clay and Carey Association voted to break joint partnership Mt. Moriah became part of the Carey Association.

The present church was erected in 1957. Mr. Earnest R. Clarke, Sr. and Mrs. Irene Sprayberry Daughterty have been members of Mt. Moriah for over 75 years. Since 1957 the church has gone through several remodeling projects and has added a fellowship hall.

I congratulate Mt. Moriah Baptist Church on their 150th anniversary and wish their congregation the best.

NATIONAL AREA HEALTH EDUCATION CENTERS (AHEC) WEEK

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to our nation's Area Health Education Centers (AHEC) as we commemorate National AHEC week.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I have strongly supported the expansion of the AHEC program, which was created by Congress in 1971 to recruit, train and retain a health professions workforce. Today, there are 56 AHEC programs with more than 235 centers that operate in almost every state and the District of Columbia.

The first Florida AHEC program was started in 1985 at NOVA Southeastern University College of Osteopathic Medicine. Florida now has 5 program offices with 10 area health centers working in all 67 of the state's counties. These centers house 600 full-time healthcare professionals and provide more than 1.2 million hours of care to the people of Florida. They also work with over 2,000 medical, dental, nursing, and other health professions students.

The AHEC program addresses the imbalances in our healthcare system and inequities in access to and quality of healthcare. Nearly 8,000 AHEC community based training sites are located in underserved areas, including 3,500 in designated health professions shortage areas, training a workforce committed to serving underserved populations. This is accomplished by forming academic and community partnerships that link the resources of academic health centers with the needs of the communities.

AHEC has continually exceeded the Health Resources Services Administration's performance measure targets in terms of the percentage of program participants who are underrepresented minorities and from disadvantaged backgrounds; the proportion of participants that train in medically underserved communities; and the percentage of health professionals entering practice in underserved areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that our colleagues will join us in celebrating the goals

and ideals of the AHEC program as well as its immeasurable contributions to the advancement of healthcare in our most underserved communities. Thank you to all the AHEC professionals for a job well done.

HONORING MAJOR ROBERT CAMINA

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the late Major Robert Camina for his dedication and contributions to the United States Army and the Army Texas National Guard.

Major Camina started his military career on November 10, 1939 in San Antonio, Texas. He joined with the Mechanized Group Troop of the 124th Cavalry of the 56th Cavalry Brigade. Major Camina originally joined to ride horses, but when WWII broke he was given overseas orders and his unit became the last Cavalry Regiment to be dismounted. During his tour in the China-Burma-India Theatre, Major Camina served as a M.G. Squad Leader and fought alongside 1st Lieutenant Jack L. Knight, who received the Congressional Medal of Honor. For his service in the tour, Major Camina received the Bronze Star Medal and the Combat Infantry Badge.

After the war, Major Camina was discharged from military service, but rejoined in the Army Texas National Guard for 1 year. After Major Camina's military term, the U.S. Department of Agriculture hired him for the next 5 years to aid in their campaign to eradicate Hoof and Mouth Disease from Mexico. Later, Major Camina returned to Brownsville, Texas and joined the A/112th Armored Cavalry Regiment. He served in the 112th until the 49th Armored Division was activated into Federal Service by President Kennedy due to the Berlin Crisis. In 1966, Major Camina served as a Mess Steward for the next 15 years. In 1981, Major Camina retired from the Army Texas National Guard and was commissioned as a Captain in the Texas State Guard. He served as Company Commander, S-3 and S-4 in the 304th Military Police Battalion in Brownsville, Texas. He retired on October 29, 1989—almost 50 years to the date of his enlistment of the Texas National Guard.

During his time in military service, Major Camina was a highly decorated soldier. The Major received the Bronze Star, Combat Infantry Badge, Army Commendation Medal, Texas Outstanding Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Texas Faithful Service Medal and the Texas State Guard Service Medal. He also received many awards as a Mess Steward and helped his company win the Eisenhower Trophy twice.

Military service runs in his family, as four of his brothers also served in military branches. Armando Camina served in the United States Army, was considered for up to six Congressional Medals of Honor, and received a silver medal. Tino Camina served in the United States Navy and Ernest Camino served in the Air Force. Major Camina and his brothers fought for the United States and served to protect this great nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had the time to recognize the dedication, accomplishments, and commitment of the late Major Robert Camina.

RECOGNIZING THE 19TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KHOJALY TRAGEDY

HON. TIM HOLDEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Khojaly tragedy that occurred 19 years ago in Azerbaijan. Over the night from February 25th to February 26th, an unprecedented massacre was committed against the Azerbaijani people in the town of Khojaly.

Azerbaijan has been a longtime ally and friend of the United States. On Christmas Day in 1991, President George H.W. Bush announced the recognition of Azerbaijan independence along with other former Soviet Republics. Azerbaijan has been involved in NATO's Partnership for Peace program and has participated in U.S.-led military missions in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq. During this time of unrest in the Middle East, the peaceful alliance with Azerbaijan is more important than ever.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Khojaly was a grim and horrific event and I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the people of Azerbaijan on this tragic anniversary.

HONORING NEW LIFE CHURCH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

Whereas, New Life Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our county for well over fifteen (15) years; and

Whereas, Pastor Marlin D. Harris and the members of the New Life Church family today continue to uplift and inspire those in our county and beyond; and

Whereas, New Life Church has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up the community; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy and empowered our community by preaching the gospel, singing the gospel and living the gospel; and

Whereas, New Life Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with DeKalb County and the world their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the New Life Church family as they dedicate their new Church Sanctuary and for continued leadership and service to our District;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 13, 2011 as New Life Church Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 13th day of March, 2011.

TRIBUTE TO ADRIENNE THOMAS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Adrienne Thomas, the Deputy Archivist of the United States who is retiring after 41 years of distinguished service with the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). Ms. Thomas began her career of federal service straight out of Iowa State University as an archivist trainee in the Office of Presidential Libraries. Since then, she has held a number of important policy and administrative positions. Early in her career, she was instrumental in transforming the Archives into an institution at the forefront of a revolution in public access to records, following the enactment of the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act. During the 1980s, she served as the Director of Planning and Analysis and, in 1985, she was instrumental in putting in place the structure that allowed the Archives to operate as a newly created independent agency, no longer under the direction of the General Services Administration.

Perhaps her most celebrated contributions to this nation are the magnificent public spaces where she was intimately involved in overseeing construction and renovation during her time as NARA's head of Administration and Chief Financial Officer. Her vision has shown the world that archives don't have to be dark dusty repositories. This year alone, one million people will see her attention to detail and love of history when they visit the historic National Archives Building in Washington, DC to view the Charters of Freedom and other American milestone documents, respectfully and accessibly displayed following a building renovation in 2003. Another place where her dedication to excellence for the American people can be seen is just up the road in College Park, Maryland, home to NARA's state-of-the-art facility known as "Archives II," which opened in 1994. Ms. Thomas oversaw Archives II from concept to ribbon cutting. It stands today as the premier archival research center in the world—the gold standard—and a great source of pride in my congressional district.

From archivist trainee to Deputy Archivist of the United States, Ms. Thomas has mentored hundreds of employees and inspired millions of people who visit our National Archives buildings across the country. It is truly my honor to pay tribute today to Ms. Adrienne Thomas, a real "National Treasure" who worked for the American people for 41 years.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY AND AIRPORT WORKERS: SOL PRICE SPIRIT OF COOPERATION OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proclaim that organized labor is often the sole force fighting for the rights of not just union members, but all workers.

This was seen this past fall when union workers at the airport stood up for the rights of all concession, parking and restaurant workers by bringing forward a worker retention policy at the San Diego Regional Airport Authority.

Up until then, workers had no job protections in the event of new contractors taking over business at the airport. If a shop or restaurant lost its lease, every employee working there could lose their job.

Led by Airport Authority chairman Robert Gleason, the agency brought workers into the search for a solution. Workers were not only given a voice in the process, but their opinions and concerns were valued as expert testimony on the importance of the Airport Authority providing a sense of job security for workers with as many as 35 years of experience.

Even when delays in the process occurred, it was due to Airport Authority commissioners believing that they could accomplish even more through their policy.

By a final vote of 7-to-1, the Airport Authority eventually passed a worker retention policy that will protect airport workers. The vote proved that all parties can win when the voices of workers are taken into consideration.

It gives me a great honor Mr. Speaker, that in light of their passage of a worker retention policy, I join with the Executive Board of the San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council in honoring the San Diego Regional Airport Authority and Airport Workers with the 2010–2011, "Sol Price Spirit of Cooperation Award."

A TRIBUTE TO YOLANDE NICHOLSON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Yolande Nicholson.

Ms. Nicholson has been a member of the New York State Bar for more than 20 years. She earned her J.D. from Columbia University School of Law in 1989. She began her legal career practicing as a corporate finance attorney in the capital markets group at Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, the preeminent international law firm.

As a young lawyer, Ms. Nicholson had the opportunity to work with multinational corporations, international financial institutions, sovereign governments and their agencies, as well as domestic corporations and financial institutions. At Cleary, she developed her craft as a securities lawyer. From 1997 to 2003,

Ms. Nicholson served as Vice President and Assistant General Counsel at The Chase Manhattan Bank. In 2003, as an Executive on Loan from JPMorgan, she began working with Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation (BSRC) in Brooklyn to restructure and reposition the corporation's anchor commercial real estate and public housing assets. She subsequently served in the position of Executive Vice President and General Counsel at Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation. In 2006, Ms. Nicholson returned to Wall Street practice and corporate finance as a senior attorney in the financial products group at Clifford Chance, the leading international finance law firm.

On October 1, 2010, Ms. Nicholson launched her private practice, as principal of Yolande I. Nicholson P.C., specializing in foreclosure prevention, litigation and defense. Ms. Nicholson is the author of a White Paper: "Proposal to Appropriate Funding Available under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act ("EESA") in Keeping with The Troubled Asset Relief Program ("TARP") to Stabilize Hardest-Hit Communities, Support Selected Homeowner Families and Achieve Quantifiable Returns on Investment for Taxpayers and Main Street Communities" (copyright July 2010). With the White Paper, she lends her knowledge and voice to the proposals aimed at precluding foreclosure sales against homeowners who are hardest hit by high unemployment, predatory lending and mortgage fraud.

Ms. Nicholson was born in Grenada, W.I., into an extended family of ever-aspiring parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles that included notable school principals, teachers, nurses, musicians and entrepreneurs. She credits her father for teaching her and her siblings the value of community activism; her mother for teaching them the value of community service; and both for serving as daily examples of grace and dignity. She aims to continue applying her law license, experience and practice in a manner that is responsible and thoughtful when delivering advice and representation to clients.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Yolande Nicholson.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER CALOMIRIS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life of Christopher Calomiris, who is fondly remembered by the residents of the District of Columbia and this region for a landmark business, Calomiris Fruits & Vegetables at the Eastern Market—a family owned and operated business for 62 years.

As the child of Greek immigrants, Christopher grew up on Capitol Hill and was groomed in his father's D.C. produce business, which was located in several markets before settling at Eastern Market. With Christopher Calomiris' gentle and dependable guidance, Calomiris Fruits & Vegetables thrived and continues to offer their signature friendly, high-quality customer service with the leadership of Christopher's wife, Maria, and the

Calomiris children, Tom, Leon, and Joy, all of whom helped in this classic generational business.

Christopher Calomiris' battle with cancer over the last several years did not prevent him from working on weekends to continue to support the family business. The business that Christopher Calomiris built represents the best tradition of family-centered, American-made business.

In recognizing his lifetime of hard and productive work and service to the community, I ask the House to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Christopher Calomiris of Calomiris Fruits & Vegetables in Washington, DC.

CONGRATULATING SKYLINE HIGH SCHOOL ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Skyline High School for 40 years of outstanding service to the Dallas community. Skyline first opened on March 1st, 1971 as our nation's first magnet school. Since then, thousands of students have graced the halls of Skyline, and many have gone on to make immense contributions to the Dallas Metroplex.

Skyline's diverse student body has excelled academically with students earning nearly \$25 million in scholarships last year. Under the leadership of Principal Harold Wright, Skyline earned a "higher performing school" rating from the National Center for Education Accountability. The motto of "Unity in Effort...Pride in Result" exemplifies the drive and achievement of Skyline's students, teachers and administrators.

Skyline has had many illustrious alumni, including: Dallas City Counsel Member, Pauline Medrano; Olympian, Michael Johnson; and Bryan Trubey, principle designer and architect of the new Dallas Cowboys stadium. These individuals continue to utilize their education at Skyline to give back to the community.

Skyline High School was the first of many outstanding magnet schools in the Dallas area, and helped revolutionize the way we approach education. They have shown with the proper resources and motivation students can and will succeed. I am proud to represent Skyline High School, and look forward to its success in the years ahead.

HONORING FIREFIGHTER HOWARD CARPENTER

HON. NAN A.S. HAYWORTH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Firefighter Howard Carpenter of Kent, New York for his steadfast commitment and dedication to our community as a forty-year active member of the Kent Volunteer Fire Department. Firefighter Carpenter is a founding member of the Kent Fire Department and

has remained active for the entirety of its existence. Firefighters like Mr. Carpenter have a crucial role in protecting our homes and families. It is because of committed volunteer firefighters like Mr. Carpenter that our communities have active emergency responders that come to our rescue in our times of need. Mr. Carpenter has a longstanding history of commitment to his community and his fellow firefighters. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Firefighter Howard Carpenter for his 40 years of outstanding fire service.

A TRIBUTE TO SHEILA A. DURANT

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Sheila A. Durant.

Early on, Sheila Durant discovered her life's passion: educating children. She carried this passion for over 30 years and continues to do so. Sheila was born and raised in New York City, as one of five children. At an early age, her parents instilled the value of discipline, determination, and having a dream. Sheila knew her calling was to be an educator. Sheila's own education began in the New York City's public school system, a diverse and multicultural learning environment. She went on to enter the CUNY system and earned a Master's degree in special education from Hunter College. Sheila later received an Administrative Diploma in School Administration from the City College of New York.

When Sheila Durant became Assistant Principal at P.S. 69, in 2003, the State of New York designated the school, "a School in Need of Improvement." Fortunately, she worked with a principal who was an outstanding educational leader, mentor and collaborative partner. Together, they sought to build a "learning" community, dedicated to a climate of open communication, sharing, collaboration, and respect. They began reform at P.S. 69 by implementing conflict resolution platforms for teachers, students, and parents. The school is now constantly improving. Since 2003, Advocates for Children recognized P.S. 69 as both a school of choice and one of the "top 100 schools" in New York City. Today, Sheila is the Principal of P.S. 69. Her journey from Assistant Principal to Principal gave her invaluable insight into making P.S. 69 a successful child-centered educational environment.

Growing as a leader and a continual learner, Ms. Durant is involved in a number of other organizations. She is a member of the Greater Central Baptist Church, New York Academy of Public Education, New York Elementary School Principal Association, Schools That Can, Harvard's Wide World, CEI-PEA, North American Reggio Emilia Alliance, and Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. She is also the Executive Board member for Council School Consortium and serves as a board member of 500 men.

A guiding principle influenced Sheila's career: "Good teachers move mountains for their students, great teachers show their students how to move mountains for themselves." Sheila's goal is to prepare her students with

the skill and desire to achieve their dreams. Sheila welcomes parents as collaborative partners seeking to educate their children's young minds and hearts. Together with her dedicated staff, she will continue to strive to prepare all students for college readiness, as digital learners, to compete in a global society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sheila A. Durant.

BOB BALGENORTH, STATE BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA SPIRIT OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very dedicated, committed leader of the labor movement in our state who deserves to be recognized for his many achievements and contributions to organized labor.

Since being awarded the title of "Apprentice of the Year" by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 441 in 1969, Bob Balgenorth has dedicated his life to protecting the rights of workers in California's construction industry.

After being elected business manager/financial secretary of his local union and head of the Orange County Building Trades Council, Balgenorth has spent the past 18 years as president of the State Building & Construction Trades Council of California, which represents the 186 private-sector building trades local unions and regional councils that represent 350,000 men and women employed in the state's construction industry.

As president of the council, President Balgenorth has helped forge a partnership between two historically opposed movements: the construction industry and environmentalists. While advocating on behalf of construction workers throughout the state, he's also served on the boards of environmental organizations such as the California Apollo Alliance, California Unions for Reliable Energy, the California League of Conservation Voters, and the California Foundation on the Environment and the Economy.

With leaders such as President Balgenorth pressing to develop relationships with non-traditional allies, the Labor Movement is positioned to build a broad coalition of support for workers rights.

It gives me a great honor Mr. Speaker, because of President Balgenorth's career-long commitment to building solidarity between interests which have traditionally been opposed, I join with the Executive Board of the San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council in honoring him with the 2010-2011, "Spirit of Solidarity Award."

TRIBUTE TO BERT RANDOLPH SUGAR

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me

in honoring Bert Randolph Sugar for his contributions to the boxing profession, as well as for his support of youth in the District of Columbia at Kids In Trouble, Inc. By serving as a member on the Board of Directors of Kids In Trouble, Inc., Mr. Sugar, a native Washingtonian, a graduate of District of Columbia Public Schools, and a boxing historian, has provided our youth with special inspiration by his achievements. His induction into the International Boxing Hall of Fame in 2005 speaks to his special talents, and makes all D.C. residents, particularly our children at Kids In Trouble, Inc., proud.

Throughout his career, Bert Randolph Sugar has honed his skills as a boxing analyst, making frequent appearances on HBO's pay-per-view boxing broadcasts and ESPN. He has published dozens of books and articles, and has served as an editor of *Boxing Illustrated* and of *Ring Magazine*.

Over the years, Kids In Trouble, Inc. has grown to serve thousands of D.C. youth, especially in the Brightwood neighborhood in Northwest D.C. Bert Randolph Sugar has contributed to our youth at Kids In Trouble, Inc. over several decades, and was honored with the Kids In Trouble, Inc. 2005 Lifetime Achievement Award at the 40th Anniversary Toy Drive for needy children in D.C.

I applaud the contributions Bert Randolph Sugar has made to Kids In Trouble, Inc. to help improve the lives of minority and under-represented youth residing in the District of Columbia. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Bert Randolph Sugar for his contributions to Kids In Trouble, Inc., his commitment to youth in the District of Columbia, and particularly for a lifetime of achievements.

A TRIBUTE TO SALEMA DAWSON-MARBURY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Salema Dawson-Marbury.

Salema grew up in the Hollis neighborhood of Queens, New York. She attended Jamaica High School and went on to attain several educational degrees: a Bachelor of Science degree in Applied Mathematics, from Stony Brook University; a Master of Science degree in Secondary School Math Education, from Lehman College; and a Master of Arts degree in Educational Administration, from City College. Salema is married to Done E. Marbury, Jr.; has two step-sons, Duwan A. Marbury and Done E. Marbury, III; and a step-grandson, O'mari M. Marbury.

Salema is the Principal of the P.S. 329 in Coney Island, Brooklyn. She began her educational career in 1988, as an intermediate school teacher at two schools: I.S. 1116, in the South Bronx; and the Mark Twain Intermediate School for the Gifted and Talented, in Coney Island, Brooklyn. Although her first passion is teaching math, she became known for developing programs to improve student self-esteem, academic prowess and leadership.

Early in her career, Salema realized that most children dream of becoming rich and fa-

mous in the same manner as their favorite sports, television and movie stars. She knew this dream would not be a reality for most students. Salema felt that what children really desired was acknowledgement for their accomplishments and the opportunity to achieve economic power in the process. She became determined to provide students with the direction they needed to achieve recognition and economic success. Salema began her tenure at P.S. 329 in 1995, as a teacher in charge of attendance improvement. She was later appointed to Assistant Principal in 1998 and, in 2008, she became the Principal. She is heavily involved in the school community. She established several of the schools seminal programs, including the school's Young Entrepreneurship Program and the school's Performing Arts Program. She also writes, co-produces and co-directs the school's annual drama and dance productions.

Salema believes that all children possess a unique talent. She encourages her students to, "never surrender their dreams," and strives to ensure they acquire the needed confidence for achieving their maximum potential. Salema is proud of her and her staff's work. Today, P.S. 139 is commonly referred to as, "Coney Islands Best Kept Secret."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Salema Dawson-Marbury.

THE TAX FREE TIPS ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to help millions of working Americans by introducing the Tax Free Tip Act. As the title suggests, this legislation exempts tips from federal income and payroll taxes. Tips often compose a substantial portion of the earnings of waiters, waitresses, and other service-sector employees. However, unlike regular wages, a service-sector employee usually has no guarantee of, or legal right to, a tip. Instead, the amount of a tip usually depends on how well an employee satisfies a client. Since the amount of taxes one pays increases along with the size of the tip, taxing tips punishes workers for doing a superior job!

Many service-sector employers are young people trying to make money to pay for their education, or single parents struggling to provide for their children. Oftentimes, these workers work two jobs in hopes of making a better life for themselves and their families. The Tax Free Tips Act gives these hard-working Americans an immediate pay raise. People may use this pay raise to devote more resources to their children's, or their own, education, or to save for a home, retirement, or to start their own businesses.

Helping Americans improve themselves by reducing their taxes will make our country stronger. I therefore hope all my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring the Tax Free Tips Act.

HONORING STATE
REPRESENTATIVE JOHN CAREY

HON. DAN BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man of determination, conviction and integrity—State Representative John Carey of Durant, Ok.

Carey, a former member of the Oklahoma House of Representatives, served his district and state with distinction during the years of 2002 to 2010.

John's legislative work has been devoted to improving education, making the state government more efficient and helping the brave men and women who have served our nation in the military.

His personal career has also been focused on improving the lives of hard-working Oklahoma families through economic development, business growth and community outreach.

Representative Carey has been active in civic affairs for several years, serving as a Gear-Up mentor, a Crisis Control board member, a board member of the Oklahoma State University Consumer & Family Services Advisory Committee, past chairman of the Bryan County Junior Livestock Show and as a member of the Southeastern Oklahoma State University Homecoming Committee.

It is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to acknowledge not only his successes in the Oklahoma legislature, but also his work as a devoted father and a steadfast friend.

John Carey is the husband of Pam Carey and father of G.W., Emma, and Anna Carey.

The 21st House District of Oklahoma is a better place because of the service of my friend and colleague, John Carey.

A TRIBUTE TO MS. VERA WINN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Ms. Vera Winn.

Vera received a Bachelors of Science degree in Nutritional Management from SUNY Empire State College. She is a New York State certified Dietitian-Nutritionist and, for 29 years, was employed by Nassau County as a dietitian.

Vera is an active member of the Brooklyn community. Since 1968, she participated in organizations such as the Stuyvesant Heights Lions Club and the Brooklyn Club of the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs ("NANBPWC"), Inc. Vera is widely recognized for her commitments. Among her list of accolades, she received the Lion Foundation's highest honor, the Melvin Jones Fellow Award; and the NANBPWC's highest honor, the Sojourner Truth Award.

Vera is extremely dedicated to the NANBPWC and Lions Club, serving both organizations in several capacities over the years. Vera's list of positions with the NANBPWC includes Third Vice President in charge of Youth

and Young Adult Clubs, Chairperson of Public Relations, and Chairperson of the Bylaws Committee. Her list of positions with the Lions Club includes Fundraising Chairperson, Chairperson for Membership and Retention, and Chairperson for the Afternoon of Elegance.

From 1993 to 2003, Vera served as Public Board Member of the University of the State of New York's Education Department. She was later reappointed to serve on the peer panel as an extended member until September 2013. Vera received an award of achievement and appreciation from the University of the State of New York's Education Department for this dedication. The award was signed by President Mills and the Commissioner of Education.

Vera is a member of the American College of Counselors and a member of the World Changers Church of New York. Vera is the wife of the late Franger Winn, Jr.; mother to two daughters, Franshonne Winn-Amelemah, Esq. and Gale Winn Inlaw, Library Media Specialist; and mother-in law to Edward Amelemah, M.D. She is also grandmother of Win Inlaw and David Franger Amelemah.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life of Ms. Vera Winn.

UNITED FOOD & COMMERCIAL
WORKERS LOCAL 135, LABOR
UNION OF THE YEAR:

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very dedicated Labor organization that has distinguished itself in San Diego County.

In Labor, we realize that hard-fought victories can only be accomplished if we stand together to reach a common goal.

This is especially true when unions come together to stand up for issues that don't directly affect their membership. The United Food and Commercial Workers Local 135 is an example of how all unions can contribute to Labor's victories.

The blue and yellow of UFCW Local 135 can be seen at nearly every Labor Council event.

From precinct walks to rallies and job actions, UFCW Local 135 understands that Labor must stand up for each other in order for it to achieve success.

In the weeks leading up to June's primary election, at least a dozen UFCW Local 135 members volunteered for each precinct walk and weekly phone banks to protect union jobs in construction, an industry in which they have no members.

This was repeated in the fall as UFCW Local 135 strongly supported the election of Jerry Brown for governor.

This leadership by example was rewarded throughout 2010 as members from other unions supported UFCW Local 135's priority issue of requiring large big box retailers to prove they don't have a negative economic impact on neighborhoods.

The desire of other unions to write letters, make phone calls and attend community planning meetings was a result of the respect won by UFCW Local 135 for the solidarity they've shown other unions.

For their exemplary display of leadership and volunteerism, I join with the San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council in honoring United Food and Commercial Workers Local 135 as 2011—San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council's Union of the Year.

PRO LIFE

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor notable women in America's history, like Alice Paul and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who fought to extend American rights and freedoms to every American citizen. These women, who played an integral role in extending the right for women to vote, held American ideals and standards in the highest regard. One of the principles that they considered to be sacred is the sanctity of life. Not only did America's founding women fight to ensure each and every citizen was vested with the unalienable rights granted by our Constitution, they also fought to preserve the life of every American, including the unborn.

Today, I firmly believe that the right to life needs to continue to be protected. As a pro life Member of Congress, I have made it a priority of mine to fight for the most vulnerable members of our society. I have been proud to uphold the sanctity of life by supporting legislation that affirms that life begins at the moment of conception, defunds Planned Parenthood and prohibits any federal funding from ever being used for abortions. I joined with my colleagues to repeal the government takeover of healthcare, which would overturn a 30 year bipartisan effort banning all federal dollars from being used for abortions.

I will continue to fight to preserve the America that these women fought for so hard, and this includes protecting the right to life for the unborn.

HONORING FIREFIGHTER DOUGLAS
CASEY

HON. NAN A.S. HAYWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Firefighter Douglas Casey of Kent, New York for his steadfast commitment and dedication to our community as a forty year active member of the Kent Volunteer Fire Department. Firefighter Casey is a founding member of the Kent Fire Department and has remained active for the entirety of its existence. Firefighters like Mr. Casey have a crucial role in protecting our homes and families. It is because of committed volunteer firefighters like Mr. Casey that our communities have active emergency responders that come to our rescue in our times of need. Mr. Casey has a longstanding history of commitment to his community and his fellow firefighters. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Firefighter Douglas Casey for his 40 years of outstanding fire service.

A TRIBUTE TO ANA WALKER-
GOLDSON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the achievements of Ana Walker-Goldson.

Ana was born and raised in the Canal Zone of the Republic of Panama. She was exposed to business at an early age; her grandparents, Claude and Louise Walker, were proprietors of the McGrath Walker Business School and Publishers of the Panama Tribune. Ana holds two degrees from Long Island University: a B.A. in Business Administration and a M.A. in Communication. Over the years, she worked in an administrative capacity for several companies, including Beecher, Peck & Lewis and Borden, Inc.

Ana is a founding member, and former Senior Vice President, of the Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Inc (CACCI). She presently serves as the Director of Operations for the Flatbush Caton Market on behalf of CACCI. Flatbush Caton Market, located in the East Flatbush section of Brooklyn, houses over 45 vendors of diverse ethnic backgrounds and several offices. The market was envisioned and initiated by former New York City Councilmember Una Clarke to remove vendors from the streets. It was officially opened in January 2002. Under Ana's leadership, the market received the distinguished Village Voice "NYC 2009 Best Ethnic Market Award" and is recognized and showcased by numerous media outlets.

Ana is a mentor to many, including Aduke Aremu, with whom she partnered to create the International Arts Business School. Ana is widely recognized for her community dedication and youth advocacy. She received numerous awards from community leaders, including Congresswoman YVETTE CLARK and Brooklyn Borough President Marty Markowitz.

Ana is married to a retired military officer, Fernando Goldson. They are proud parents of their daughter, Sonja, and equally proud of their grandchildren. Ana is truly a people person. She lives her life by being a blessing to those she serves. Ana's greatest accomplishment is her daughter, a soft cleft baby and a breast cancer survivor. She thanks her mother, Iona Walker, for the gift of life and gives God Almighty all the glory for the things He has done and will continue to do in her life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ana Walker-Goldson.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF TENSION ENVELOPE COMPANY

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today in recognition of the 125th Anniversary of Tension Envelope Corporation, a prestigious family-owned business in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, which I am honored to represent. In 1886, the forerunner of

Tension Envelope opened in Kansas City, Missouri, as Berkowitz and Company. Named after its founder, William Berkowitz, the company specialized in popular advertising novelties and business stationery. In 1894, the company put into operation the first envelope machine west of the Mississippi River.

By 1901, the company began to fully concentrate on envelopes, which were in great demand by businesses and organizations. William Berkowitz's two sons joined the firm in 1907, and the company's first envelope patent was issued in 1909. Sons Walter and E.B. Berkowitz assumed management of the company as the 1920s approached. Walter soon discovered new high-speed envelope folding machinery that had been developed in Germany. The company purchased the North American patent and distribution rights and brought the equipment into the United States, revolutionizing the American envelope industry.

In 1937, the company acquired another pioneer in the U.S. envelope industry, the Tension Envelope Company of Brooklyn, New York. In 1944, all of the Berkowitz Envelope manufacturing and sales operations were consolidated under the widely recognized name of Tension Envelope Corporation. In 1962, Bert Berkley, grandson of the company's founder, became President and CEO of Tension. In 1988, Bill Berkley, great grandson of the founder, became President and CEO.

Today, Tension Envelope Corporation is one of the nation's leading manufacturers of envelope products, selling directly to companies and organizations across the United States. Tension manufactures many of the envelopes you see and handle every day. With its headquarters in Kansas City, Missouri, the heart of Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, Tension produces over eleven billion envelopes a year with plants, distribution, and service offices stretching from coast to coast.

Not only have Tension's leaders revolutionized an industry with their ingenuity, they are also dedicated philanthropists. Bert Berkley, Chairman of Tension, has a long history of participation in local, regional, and national civic and advisory councils. He even co-authored a book, *Giving Back*, on the subject of volunteering, sharing with the community, and involvement with charitable endeavors. My good friend, Richard Berkley, served as Mayor of Kansas City, Missouri, for three terms prior to my election to that post in 1991. He currently serves as Tension's Secretary and Treasurer as well as several area civic advisory boards. Current President and CEO, Bill Berkley, has served on the boards of several area nonprofits, businesses, and education organizations.

Considering the tremendous contributions of Tension Envelope Corporation to Missouri's Fifth Congressional District and surrounding areas, it is an honor and a privilege to recognize the leaders and employees for their one hundred and twenty-five years of excellent service to the Kansas City area and beyond. Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the Berkley Family and expressing our gratitude to Tension Envelope Corporation for their incredible dedication to both their industry and community.

JIM MAHLER, LABOR LEADER OF
THE YEAR

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very dedicated committed leader of the labor movement who deserves to be recognized for his many achievements and contributions to organized labor.

The past year was an important one in the history of California's Labor Movement, with workers campaigning to restore a pro-labor governor for California.

Tens of thousands of California's union members dedicated 2010 to ensuring that our next governor would stand up for the fundamental right of workers to organize.

In San Diego, American Federation of Teachers Local 1931 President Jim Mahler answered nearly every call in ensuring that collective bargaining rights and worker protections remained a priority in California.

As workers prepared for the March for California's Future, which featured union members marching from Bakersfield to Sacramento in a call to solve the state's budget crisis, Mahler committed his union to driving its success. Several buses full of AFT Local 1931 members and their students left San Diego City College at dawn on March 5, bound for Los Angeles and Bakersfield, to kick off the historic march.

When the Labor Council proposed an aggressive approach to courting voters' support for Jerry Brown for governor, Mahler and AFT Local 1931 committed \$100,000 to fund the program. He also realized money alone could not win the governor's race, so he organized nightly phone banks to support Brown and Proposition 25, the simple majority budget bill. His organizing yielded phone bank nights and Saturday precinct walks that overflowed with student and teacher volunteers.

For his dedication to keeping California worker-friendly, I join with the Executive Board of the Labor Council in congratulating Jim Mahler as the 2011 Labor Leader of the Year.

A TRIBUTE TO DENISE SULLIVAN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Ms. Denise Sullivan.

Denise Sullivan was born in Jamaica, New York, to Albert C. Wiltshire and the late Jeannette Morgan-Wiltshire. Denise has three wonderful children, Chris, Michael and Danielle. She takes great pride in her public school education and understands the importance of higher education; Denise graduated from Forest Hills High School and New York City Technical College (formerly known as New York City Community College).

While Denise pursued a liberal arts curriculum at New York City Technical College, she had career interests in healthcare. Denise entered the profession in 1985, as a Registration Clerk for the Cumberland Diagnostic & Treatment Center. Her exemplary work for this

company resulted in a promotion to Specialty Clinics Supervisor. Denise enrolled in the Nurse's Aide Program at Medgar Evers College shortly thereafter.

Upon graduating Medgar Evers College Nurse's Aide Program, and successfully passing the Boards, Denise continued her education: She became a Patient Care Associate, after attending Woodhull Hospital's Patient Care Associate Program; and received her Licensed Practical Nurse certification from the Brooklyn Adult Learning Center. Today,

Denise works as a Licensed Practical Nurse in the Adult Medicine Clinic.

Denise's passion for delivering health care extends to community service. She participated in numerous programs and organized events over the years, including Arlington Terrace & 154th Street Stop the Violence; and Weekend "Safe Place," where she mentored students and created educational, social and sports activities. In addition, she consistently participates in the annual Breast Cancer Walk with her children, brothers, sisters, nephews

and nieces. Denise believes that everyone has a contribution to make in caring and encouraging family and the community. Denise, with her selfless ways, is an example of commitment, giving so much of her time for a better community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life of Ms. Denise Sullivan.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 17, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 29

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. European Command and U.S. Strategic Command in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Suzan D. Johnson Cook, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, Department of State.

SD-419

Armed Services

Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine Department of Defense efficiencies initiatives.

SR-232A

MARCH 30

10 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings to examine how complexity, uncertainty and other factors impact responses to tax incentives.

SD-215

10:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings to examine the legislative presentations from Paralyzed Veterans of America, Air Force

Sergeants Association, Military Order of the Purple Heart, National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, Wounded Warrior Project, Vietnam Veterans of America, The Retired Enlisted Association, American Ex-Prisoners of War.

SD-106

1 p.m.

Armed Services

Personnel Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the National Park Service.

SD-366

MARCH 31

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

2 p.m.

Foreign Relations

Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Global Narcotics Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine counter-narcotics and citizen security in the Americas.

SD-419

APRIL 5

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Armed Services

Airland Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

APRIL 6

10 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Allison A. Hickey, of Virginia,

to be Under Secretary for Benefits and Steve L. Muro, of California, to be Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs, both of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SR-418

APRIL 7

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Transportation Command and U.S. Africa Command in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.

SD-106

2:15 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of David Bruce Shear, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and Kurt Walter Tong, of Maryland, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as United States Senior Official for the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum, both of the Department of State.

SD-419

APRIL 12

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SH-219 following the open session.

SD-106

APRIL 14

10 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 343, to amend Title I of PL 99-658 regarding the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau, to approve the results of the 15-year review of the Compact, including the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Palau Following the Compact of Free Association Section 432 Review, and to appropriate funds for the purposes of the amended PL 99-658 for fiscal years ending on or before September 30, 2024, to carry out the agreements resulting from that review.

SD-366

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1709–S1770

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 592–603, and S. Res. 103. **Pages S1750–51**

Measures Passed:

Statue of Gerald R. Ford: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 27, providing for the acceptance of a statue of Gerald R. Ford from the people of Michigan for placement in the United States Capitol. **Page S1768**

Reducing the Senate Budget: Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 94, to express the sense of the Senate in support of reducing its budget by at least 5 percent, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S1768**

Joint Committee on Printing and Joint Committee of Congress on the Library Senate Membership: Senate agreed to S. Res. 103, providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library. **Pages S1768–69**

Measures Considered:

SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1715–47**

Adopted:

By 98 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 41), Nelson (NE) Amendment No. 182, of a perfecting nature. **Page S1715**

By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 42), Snowe Amendment No. 193, to strike the Federal authorization of the National Veterans Business Development Corporation. **Pages S1715, S1716**

By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 43), Landrieu (for Casey) Amendment No. 216, to require contractors to notify small business concerns

that have been included in offers relating to contracts let by Federal agencies. **Pages S1716–17, S1744–46**

Pending:

McConnell Amendment No. 183, to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change. **Pages S1715, S1726–28, S1741–44**

Vitter Amendment No. 178, to require the Federal Government to sell off unused Federal real property. **Page S1715**

Inhofe (for Johanns) Amendment No. 161, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements to payments made to corporations, payments for property and other gross proceeds, and rental property expense payments. **Page S1715**

Cornyn Amendment No. 186, to establish a bipartisan commission for the purpose of improving oversight and eliminating wasteful government spending. **Pages S1717–22**

Paul Amendment No. 199, to cut \$200,000,000,000 in spending in fiscal year 2011. **Pages S1722–23**

Sanders Amendment No. 207, to establish a point of order against any efforts to reduce benefits paid to Social Security recipients, raise the retirement age, or create private retirement accounts under title II of the Social Security Act. **Pages S1723–26**

Hutchison Amendment No. 197, to delay the implementation of the health reform law in the United States until there is final resolution in pending lawsuits. **Pages S1729–30**

Coburn Amendment No. 184, to provide a list of programs administered by every Federal department and agency. **Pages S1737–38**

Pryor Amendment No. 229, to establish the Patriot Express Loan Program under which the Small Business Administration may make loans to members of the military community wanting to start or expand small business concerns. **Pages S1740–41**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, March 17, 2011. **Page S1769**

Additional Continuing Appropriations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 12 noon, on Thursday, March 17, 2011, Senate begin consideration of H.J. Res. 48, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011; that there be up to three hours of debate, equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the joint resolution be read a third time and Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution; that there be no amendments in order to the joint resolution prior to the vote. **Page S1767**

Jackson Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that following disposition of H.J. Res. 48, Additional Continuing Appropriations, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Amy Berman Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, that there be two minutes for debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, without intervening action or debate; and that no further motions be in order. **Page S1768**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

5 Army nominations in the rank of general.

2 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

2 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S1767–68, S1769–70**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Mary Geiger Lewis, of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

Jane Margaret Triche-Milazzo, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

5 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army. **Page S1769**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S1709, S1750**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1750**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1751–52**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1752–58**

Additional Statements: **Page S1750**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1758–66**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S1766**

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Pages S1766–67

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—43) **Pages S1715, S1716, S1746**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:06 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 17, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1769.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of the Navy, after receiving testimony from Ray Mabus, Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Gary Roughead, USN, Chief, Naval Operations, and General James F. Amos, USMC, Commandant, Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Environmental Protection Agency, after receiving testimony from Lisa P. Jackson, Administrator, and Barbara J. Bennett, Chief Financial Officer, both of the Environmental Protection Agency.

NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATE ON IRAN

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on the updated National Intelligence Estimate on Iran and other related matters from Andrew M. Gibb, National Intelligence Office for Weapons of Mass Destruction and Proliferation, National Intelligence Council.

MODERNIZING GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the Task Force on Government Performance to examine modernizing government performance, focusing on using the new framework, and providing opportunities to help address fiscal, performance, and management challenges, after receiving testimony from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; John D. Podesta, The Center for

American Progress Action Fund, Washington, D.C.; and Robert Shea, Grant Thornton LLP, Alexandria, Virginia.

STATE OF ONLINE CONSUMER PRIVACY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of online consumer privacy, after receiving testimony from Jon Leibowitz, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; Lawrence E. Strickling, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, National Telecommunications and Information Administration; Erich Andersen, Microsoft Corporation, Barbara Lawler, Intuit Inc., Christopher R. Calabrese, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and Ashkan Soltani, all of Washington, D.C.; and John Montgomery, GroupM Interaction, New York, New York.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE BP DEEPWATER HORIZON OIL SPILL AND OFFSHORE DRILLING REPORT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the report to the President from the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, after receiving testimony from former Senator Bob Graham, and William Reilly, both a Co-Chair, National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling.

HEALTH REFORM LESSONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine health reform, focusing on lessons learned during the first year, after receiving testimony from Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary of Health and Human Services; and Paul N. Van De Water, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and Douglas Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum, both of Washington, D.C.

LIBYA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing on Libya from Intelligence Community Briefers.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Joseph M. Torsella, of Pennsylvania, to be Representative to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador, Department of State, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

AFGHANISTAN PROGRESS AND EXPECTATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing on Afghanistan, focusing on progress and expectations from General David H. Petraeus, Commander, International Security Assistance Force, Afghanistan, and Michele A. Flournoy, Under Secretary for Policy, both of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Heather A. Higginbottom, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, and Carolyn N. Lerner, of Maryland, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Kelvin K. Droegemeier, of Oklahoma, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, and Jonathan Andrew Hatfield, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Corporation for National and Community Service.

Also, committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 112th Congress:

Subcommittee on Children and Families: Senators Mikulski (Chair), Murray, Sanders, Casey, Hagan, Merkley, Franken, Bennet, Blumenthal, Burr, Alexander, Isakson, Paul, McCain, Roberts, and Kirk.

Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety: Senators Murray (Chair), Bingaman, Franken, Bennet, Whitehouse, Blumenthal, Isakson, Alexander, Hatch, and Kirk.

Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging: Senators Sanders (Chair), Mikulski, Bingaman, Casey, Hagan, Merkley, Whitehouse, Paul, Burr, Isakson, Hatch, and Murkowski.

Senators Harkin and Enzi are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Bernice Bouie Donald, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Alexander, J. Paul Oetken, and Paul A. Engelmayer, both to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Ramona Villagomez Manglona, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, who was introduced by Representative Sablan, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATIONS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentations from AMVETS, Jewish War Veterans, Military Officers Association of America, Gold Star Wives, Blinded Veterans Association, Non Commissioned Officers Association, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Fleet Reserve Association, after receiving testimony from Roy Kekahuna, Blinded Veterans Association (BVA), Tom Tarantino, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America (IAVA), and Stephen R. Zeitz, Jewish War Veterans of the USA, all of Washington, D.C.; John R. Davis, Fleet Reserve Association (FRA), Robert F. Norton, Military Officers Association of America, and H. Gene Overstreet, Non Commissioned Officers Association of the United States

of America (NCOA), all of Alexandria, Virginia; Vivianne Cisneros Wersel, Gold Star Wives of America, Inc., Arlington, Virginia; and Jerry Hotop, AMVETS, Lanham, Maryland.

SECURITIES LENDING

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine securities lending in retirement plans, focusing on issues involving securities lending in plan investments, after receiving testimony from Charles A. Jeszeck, Acting Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; Anthony Nazzaro, A.A. Nazzaro Associates, Yardley, Pennsylvania; Ed Blount, Center for the Study of Financial Market Evolution, Washington, D.C.; Allison R. Klausner, Honeywell International Inc., Morristown, New Jersey; and Steven R. Meier, State Street Global Advisors, Boston, Massachusetts.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 35 public bills, H.R. 1109–1143; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 173, 175, were introduced. **Pages H1904–06**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1907–08**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Supplemental report on H.R. 658, to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–29, Pt. 2) and

H. Res. 174, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content (H. Rept. 112–35). **Page H1904**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Ellmers to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1845**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:36 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H1848**

Order of Business: Agreed by unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Con. Res. 28 in the House, if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or her designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read;

that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except (1) one hour of debate controlled by Representative Kucinich or his designee; and (2) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and that section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) not apply to the concurrent resolution.

Page H1852

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, March 17th. **Page H1860**

NSP Termination Act: The House passed H.R. 861, to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program, by a recorded vote of 242 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 188. **Pages H1860–96**

Rejected the Braley motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 153 ayes to 272 noes, Roll No. 187. **Pages H1893–95**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H1873**

Rejected the Ellison motion that the Committee rise and report to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 182.

Pages H1874–75

Agreed to:

Ellison amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–34) that lists state-by-state funding allocations of Neighborhood Stabilization Programs Round Three potentially at risk (agreed that the voice vote by which the amendment was rejected be vacated to the end that the Chair put the question de novo);

Pages H1875–77, H1878

Hurt amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–34) that ensures that all unobligated balances rescinded by the bill will be retained in the Treasury's General Fund for the purpose of deficit reduction; and

Pages H1877–78

Castor en bloc amendment (consisting of No. 9 and No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–34) that requires the GAO to conduct a study, within 90 days of the bills enactment, of the economic impact the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Round Three would have on communities around the United States and requires the GAO to conduct a study, within 90 days of the bills enactment, of the economic impact the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Rounds One and Two have had on communities around the United States.

Pages H1888–90

Rejected:

Loretta Sanchez amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–34) that sought to add a new section with Congressional findings that if the rescinded and canceled amounts were instead made available for NSP, the Congress could have rebuilt U.S. neighborhoods;

Pages H1879–80

Richardson amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–34) that sought to amend the effective date of H.R. 861 to the sooner of: (1) 5 years from the date of enactment; or (2) the date when the national average of underwater mortgages on 1- to 4-family residential properties is 10 percent or less and the percentage of underwater mortgages relating to such properties in the state with the highest percentage of underwater residential properties is 15 percent or less;

Pages H1880–83

Ellison amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–34) that sought to provide findings for the need for and efficacy of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 183);

Pages H1878–79, H1890–91

Waters amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–34) that sought to require the Secretary of HUD to send a notice to NSP grantees that would have received funding under NSP that the

program has been terminated (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 184);

Pages H1883–84, H1891

Waters amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–34) that sought to require the Secretary of HUD to study the number of homes that will not be mitigated in each Congressional district as a result of the funding rescission, and report findings to Congress (by a recorded vote of 178 ayes to 249 noes, Roll No. 185); and

Pages H1884–85, H1891–92

Maloney amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–34) that sought to list the number of homes in each state that have been vacant for 90 days or more and which would be eligible for rehabilitation under the program, and also state that by voting to terminate this program, these units may not be able to be rehabilitated using NSP funds (by a recorded vote of 179 ayes to 246 noes, Roll No. 186).

Pages H1885–88, H1892–93

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1860.

Senate Referrals: S.J. Res. 7, S.J. Res. 8, and S.J. Res. 9 were referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Page H1904

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1859–60, H1874–75, H1890–91, H1891, H1891–92, H1892–93, H1894–95, and H1895–96. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

CHESAPEAKE BAY TMDL

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry held a hearing to review the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, agricultural conservation practices, and their implications on national watersheds. Testimony was heard from Dave White, Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; Bob Perciasepe, Deputy Administrator, EPA; Doug Domenech, Secretary of Natural Resources, Virginia; and public witnesses.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request. Testimony was heard from

Cathie Woteki, Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, Department of Agriculture.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request. Testimony was heard from Michele Leonhart, Administrator, DEA.

DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on FY 2012 Army Budget Overview, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol. Testimony was heard from John M. McHugh, Secretary of the Army; and GEN George W. Casey, Jr., Chief of Staff, USA.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Energy, Science, Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request. Testimony was heard from Steven Koonin, Under Secretary for Science.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on FY 2012 Budget. Testimony was heard from Timothy F. Geithner, Secretary of Treasury.

HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Southwest Border Enforcement. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Homeland Security officials: Thomas Winkoski, Assistant Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection; Michael Fisher, Chief, Border Patrol; James Dinkins, Associate Director, Homeland Security Investigations; and Paul Zukunft, Rear Admiral, USCG.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Fish and Wildlife Service FY 2012 Budget Oversight Hearing. Testimony was heard from the following Fish and Wildlife officials: Dan Ashe, Deputy Director; Rowan Gould, Acting Director; and Chris Nolin, Budget Officer.

LABOR, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Health and Human Services FY12 Budget Request. Testimony was heard from Hilda Solis, Secretary of Labor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Veterans Affairs Budget. Testimony was heard from Eric K. Shinseki, Secretary of Veteran Affairs.

DEVELOPMENTS IN AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing on developments in Afghanistan. Testimony was heard from GEN David Petraeus, USA, Commander, International Security Assistance Force/United States Forces—Afghanistan; and Michelle Flournoy, Undersecretary of Defense for Policy.

CYBER COMMAND

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on the fiscal year 2012 national defense authorization budget request from the U.S. Cyber Command. Testimony was heard from GEN Keith Alexander, USA, Commander, Cyber Command; and James N. Miller, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

MILITARY HEALTH SYSTEM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on Military Health System Overview and Defense Health Program Cost Efficiencies: A Beneficiary Perspective. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AMPHIBIOUS OPERATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing on amphibious operations. Testimony was heard from Sean J. Stackley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition; Vice Admiral John T. Blake, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Integration of Capabilities and Resources; and Lt. Gen. George J. Flynn, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command.

FY 2012 BUDGET—NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power and Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a joint hearing entitled “The FY2012 Department of Energy and Nuclear Regulatory Commission Budgets.” Testimony was heard from Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy; and Gregory Jaczko, Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

MADE IN AMERICA: INCREASING JOBS THROUGH EXPORT AND TRADE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled “Made in America: Increasing Jobs through Exports and Trade.” Testimony was heard from Francisco J. Sanchez, Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.” Testimony was heard from Elizabeth Warren, Special Advisor to the Secretary of the Treasury for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Department of the Treasury.

JOB CREATION, CAPITOL FORMATION, AND MARKET CERTAINTY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled “Legislative Proposals to Promote Job Creation, Capital Formation, and Market Certainty”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FY 2012 BUDGET—AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing on the Agency for International Development and the Millennium Challenge Corporation: Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Requests and Future Directions in Foreign Assistance. Testimony was heard from Daniel Yohannes, CEO, Millennium Challenge Corporation; and Rajiv Shah, Administrator, Agency for International Development.

CYBER THREAT TO INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE ECONOMY

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies held a hearing entitled “Examining the Cyber Threat to Critical Infrastructure and the American Economy.” Testimony was heard from Philip Reiter, Deputy Under Secretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Greg Wilshusen, Director of Information Security Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing on the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Testimony was heard from Robert S. Mueller III, Director, FBI.

DE FACTO MORATORIUM IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing on the Obama Administration’s De Facto Moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico: Community and Economic Impacts. Testimony was heard from Scott Angelle, Secretary of Natural Resources, Louisiana; Elizabeth Ames Jones, Commissioner, Railroad Commission, Texas; and public witnesses.

TSA OVERSIGHT—WHOLE BODY IMAGING

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense and Foreign Operations held a hearing on TSA Oversight Part I: Whole Body Imaging. Testimony was heard from Sharon Cissna, State Representative, Alaska; Robin Kane, Assistant Administrator for Security Technology, TSA; Lee Kair, Assistant Administrator for Security Operations, TSA; and public witnesses.

PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending held a hearing on Project Labor Agreements and the Cost of Doing Business in the Construction Industry. Testimony was heard from Robert Peck, Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, GSA; Daniel Gordon, Administrator, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Executive Office of the President; David Michaels, Assistant Secretary for Occupational Health and Safety, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

TO PROHIBIT FEDERAL FUNDING OF NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO AND THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO ACQUIRE RADIO CONTENT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by a vote of 6 to 5, a closed rule providing one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule provides that all points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit.

INNOVATION AND JOB CREATION—THE SBIR PROGRAM

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing on Spurring Innovation and Job Creation: The SBIR Program. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: S. 307, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the “W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse”, ordered reported without amendment; H.R. 872, Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2011, ordered reported with amendment; and H.R. 1079, Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, ordered reported without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup of H.R. 1034, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. The bill was ordered reported without amendment.

TAX CODE TREATMENT OF ABORTION-RELATED EXPENSES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures held a hearing on the tax code’s treatment of abortion-related expenses and the changes to such tax treatment proposed by section 2 of H.R. 3—the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. Testimony was heard from Thomas A. Barthold, Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Taxation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held an organizational meeting.

Joint Meetings

NORTHERN IRELAND

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine Northern Ireland, focusing on justice in individual cases and accountability for past abuses by security services in the region, including implementation of key provisions of the Good Friday Agreement, after receiving testimony from Michael H. Posner, Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor; Jane Winter, British Rights Watch, London, England; and John Finucane, John Teggart, and Ciaran McAirt, all of Belfast, Northern Ireland.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Food and Drug Administration, 2 p.m., SD-124.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Government Printing Office (GPO), and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), 2:30 p.m., SD-138.

Committee on Armed Services, to hold hearings to examine the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine military construction, environmental, and base closure programs in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SR-323A.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP), focusing on evaluating returns on taxpayer investments, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on the Budget, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Heather A. Higginbottom, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, 2 p.m., SD-608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Subcommittee on Science and Space, to hold hearings to examine investing in Federal research and development, 10:30 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to hold hearings to examine current global investment trends in clean energy technologies and the impact of domestic policies on that investment, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works, Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety, with the Subcommittee on Green Jobs and the New Economy, to hold joint hearings to examine the “Clean Air Act” and jobs, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to hold hearings to examine popular uprisings in the Middle East, focusing on the implications for U.S. policy, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, to hold hearings to examine health insurance exchanges and ongoing state implementation of the “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act,” 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery, to hold hearings to examine recouping improperly paid Federal assistance in the aftermath of disasters, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine catastrophic preparedness, focusing on if FEMA is ready for the next big disaster, 2:30 p.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary, business meeting to consider S. 216, to increase criminal penalties for certain knowing and international violations relating to food that is misbranded or adulterated, S. 222, to limit investor and homeowner losses in foreclosures, S. 410, to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings, and the nominations of James Michael Cole, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, Edward Milton Chen, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, John J. McConnell, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island, Goodwin Liu, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Kevin Hunter Sharp, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, Roy Bale Dalton, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Claire C. Cecchi, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence, closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request, 10:15 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request, 1:30 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on Afghanistan, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol. CLOSED HEARING

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing on FY 2012 Budget, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on Geological Survey FY 2102 Budget Oversight Hearing, 9:30 a.m., B-308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Oversight, 1 p.m., B-308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, hearing on Improper Payments, 10 a.m., 2358-B Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing on Law of War Detention and the President's Executive Order Establishing Periodic Review Boards for Guantanamo Detainees, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on Military Personnel Overview, 11 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing on soldier and marine equipment for dismounted operations, 9:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing on Fulfilling the Mission of Health Retirement Security, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing on Education Regulations: Roadblocks to Student Choice in Higher Education, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "The Implementation and Sustainability of the New, Government-Administered Community Living Assistance Services and Supports (CLASS) Program." 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, entitled "Oversight of DOE Recovery Act Spending." 1:30 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing on The American Energy Initiative: focus on oil supplies, gasoline prices, and jobs in the Gulf of Mexico, 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology, hearing entitled "The Relationship of Monetary Policy and Rising Prices", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing on The Global Nuclear Revival and U.S. Nonproliferation Policy, 9:45 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing on the Colombia and Panama Free Trade Agreements: National Security and Foreign Policy Priorities, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, hearing entitled "Ensuring Effective Preparedness, Response, and Recovery for Events Impacting Health Security." 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, Subcommittee on Elections, hearing on Election Assistance Commission Operations and 2012 Budget Request, 10:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup of H.R. 1021, to prevent the termination of the temporary office of bankruptcy judges in certain judicial districts; H.R. 096, to provide for American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas to be treated as States for certain criminal justice programs; and H. Con. Res. 13, the "Reaffirming 'In God We Trust' as the official motto of the United States and supporting and encouraging the public display of the national motto in all public buildings, public schools, and other government institutions," 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing on Harnessing American Resources to Create Jobs and Address Rising Gasoline Prices: Domestic Resources and Economic Impacts, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee hearing entitled "The Freedom of Information Act: Crowd-Sourcing Government Oversight." 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 658, the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2011; and H.R. 970, the Federal Aviation Research and Development Reauthorization Act of 2011, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing on Federal Regulatory Overreach in the Railroad Industry: Implementing the Rail Safety Improvement Act, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing on Department of Veterans Affairs FY 2012 Budget for the

Veterans Benefits Administration, National Cemetery Administration, and Related Agencies, 1 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on pending trade agreements with Columbia, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing on Intelligence Authorities, 10 a.m., 304 HVC.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m.), Senate will continue consideration of S. 493, SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act. At 12 noon, Senate will begin consideration of H.J. Res. 48, Additional Continuing Appropriations, and after a period of debate, vote on passage of the joint resolution, to be followed by a vote on confirmation of the nomination of Amy Berman Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, March 17

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 1076—To prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content (Subject to a Rule) and consideration of H. Con. Res. 28—Directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La., E497
Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E498
Berkley, Shelley, Nev., E499
Bishop, Timothy H., N.Y., E501
Boren, Dan, Okla., E507
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E508
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E503
Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E497
Filner, Bob, Calif., E504, E506, E507, E508
Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E497, E497, E501

Hayworth, Nan A.S., N.Y., E497, E505, E507
Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E502
Holden, Tim, Pa., E504
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E504
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E500
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E505
Johnson, Henry C. "Hank", Jr., Ga., E498, E501, E504
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E500
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E500
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E500
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E500
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E507

Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E499
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E505, E506
Paul, Ron, Tex., E506
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E503
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E501
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E502
Townsend, Edolphus, N.Y., E504, E505, E506, E507, E508, E508
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E501
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E503



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at www.gpo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.